IBSEN IN GERMANY

WILLIAM HENRY SIEER

PT
8900
G3
E45

Cornell University Library
Ithaca, New York

BOUGHT WITH THE INCOME OF THE

SAGE ENDOWMENT FUND

THE GIFT OF

HENRY W. SAGE

1891

Cornell University Library
PT 8900.G3E45
Ibsen in Germany, 1870-1900,
3 1924 026 350 243
olin

Cornell University Library

The original of this book is in
the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in
the United States on the use of the text.

http://www.archive.org/details/cu31924026350243

PT
8900
G3
E45

STUDIES IN LITERATURE

THE STORY OF ENGLISH SPEECH. *By Charles Noble.*

A HISTORY OF ENGLISH BALLADRY. *By Frank Egbert Bryant.*

SHAKESPEARE STUDY PROGRAMS: THE TRAGEDIES. *By Charlotte Porter and Helen A. Clarke.*

SHAKESPEARE STUDY PROGRAMS: THE COMEDIES. *By Charlotte Porter and Helen A. Clarke.*

THE SPIRIT OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION AS REVEALED IN THE POETRY OF THE PERIOD. *By Samuel W. Patterson. Illustrated.*

BROWNING STUDIES. *By V. C. Harrington.*

HAMLET, AN IDEAL PRINCE. *By A. W. Crawford.*

A HISTORY OF ENGLISH LITERATURE. *By Robert H. Fletcher.*

ENGLISH ESSAYISTS. *By William H. Davis.*

PRESENT DAY AMERICAN POETRY, *and Other Essays. By Harry Houston Peckham.*

A HISTORY OF ITALIAN LITERATURE. *By Florence Traill.*

THE REIGN OF THE MANUSCRIPT. *By Perry Wayland Sinks.*

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF MAETERLINCK AS SHOWN IN HIS PLAYS. *By Granville F. Sturgis.*

GERMAN LIBERTY AUTHORS. *By Warren Washburn Florer.*

THE INFLUENCE OF FRENCH LITERATURE ON EUROPE. *By Emeline M. Jensen.*

THE NOVELS OF FERDINAND FABRE. *By Ray P. Bowen.*

LIFE AND WORKS OF FRIEDRICH HEBBEL. *By T. M. Campbell.*

IBSEN IN GERMANY. *By William H. Eller.*

RICHARD G. BADGER, PUBLISHER, BOSTON

IBSEN IN GERMANY

1870—1900

BY

WILLIAM HENRI ELLER

BOSTON
RICHARD G. BADGER
THE GORHAM PRESS

R

COPYRIGHT, 1918, BY RICHARD G. BADGER

All Rights Reserved

A 488089
BH

Made in the United States of America

The Gorham Press, Boston, U.S.A.

PREFACE

The greater part of the following investigation was presented to the Graduate School at the University of Wisconsin, 1916, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. I take this opportunity to acknowledge my indebtedness to Professor A. R. Hohlfeld and Professor E. Feise of the Department of German, and to Professor J. E. Olsen of the Department of Scandinavian Languages for their valuable suggestions and generous support.

Monthly journals published in Germany during the years 1870–1900 have been the chief source of material. Certain very desirable magazines, such as *Westermanns Monatshefte*, *Deutsche Revue*, *Die Nation*, *Die Zukunft*, among others, were inaccessible. *Bühne und Welt* and *Literarisches Echo*, for example, were omitted because not issued until the very close of the period.

Table B presents a list of books and essays which approaches completeness for the years in question. In no few instances, it is to be regretted, the present misfortune of Europe permitted no further familiarity with the publications than their mere bibliographical data.

A third important source of material is practically only within reach of those having access to the libraries in Germany. I mean the files of daily newspapers. Philipp Stein's little volume, however, quotes freely from the Berlin dailies, and from these, as well as from other references to similar sources, I conclude that the ultimate impression of

the investigation would scarcely be changed, except, perhaps, that the negative side of the controversy were more emphatically represented. The articles in the newspapers were usually struck off at white heat, reflecting the reaction of the moment; those in the journals profit by more or less deliberation.

If the opposition seems to be unduly stressed by the quotations in the succeeding pages, this is not to be attributed to any predilection of the investigator for that point of view. The positive influence of Ibsen is to be sought primarily in the creative literature of the time, and its testimony is abundant and eloquent enough. While the older generation and its supporters battled the new with words, the latter, as is always the case, was engrossed in practice rather than in verbal eloquence. In this practice Ibsen and the German appreciation of him are vindicated — if that is at all necessary.

In preference to paraphrasing various comments of a critical nature, I have given them verbatim. I have had two reasons in mind for such procedure: first, this method presents exactly what was written and allows immediate contact with the critic's point of view; second, the records themselves aid the reader to reconstruct the spirit of the epoch, *das Kulturhistorische*, which would be less tangible in my own and briefer phraseology.

I have translated all citations because I hoped the thesis would be of interest to some who know little or nothing of the German and Norse idioms. For any who might desire the original statements, and I realize how acceptable they will be to some, I have included them in the Appendix.

The translations have been made with much care. An occasional word or phrase, it is likely, may have been better rendered (for those who know, the originals are at hand),

yet I feel the discrepancies will hardly be numerous or serious enough to impair the investigation as it reads.

Ibsen's ideal was revolutionary,— his goal, a humanity of ennobled character. He made demands that the young generation in Germany endeavored to fulfill. He exercised a magic and compelling power even upon those who energetically and conscientiously resisted him. But in all there was renewed a strength and faith — a faith in themselves to solve the problems of life in their modern confusion and complexity.

If I have succeeded to a moderate degree in presenting fairly the struggle between the "Northern Sphinx" and his younger German contemporaries, I shall be willing to forget the difficulties under which the attempt was made.

W. H. E.

Vanderbilt University
Nashville, Tennessee
Spring, 1918

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	The German Drama, 1870–1885	11
II	Björnstjerne Björnson	19
III	Ibsen in Germany During the Seventies	26
IV	Gathering Forces, 1880–1886	36
V	Traditional Barriers Broken, 1887–1891	58
VI	Ibsen's Later Works and the Efflorescence of the German Drama, 1891–1900	102
VII	Conclusion	121
Appendix		131
1	Table A	133
2	Table B	136
3	Citations	173
4	Bibliography	193
Index		199

IBSEN IN GERMANY

CHAPTER I

THE GERMAN DRAMA, 1870–1885

THE history of German literature during the last thirty years of the nineteenth century is in a great measure the record of a revolution. Characteristic of revolutionary movements is their protest against existing grievances, real or imagined. These occupy the minds of the revolutionists to the exclusion of, at the expense of, what is commendable in the old régime,— a procedure which experience has proved practical. Ignoring, therefore, willfully or through ignorance, what had been accomplished in belles lettres of the first rank, the recent German revolutionists joined forces against current taste, against those authors, mainly, whom the general reading public proclaimed representative of the day's art and culture.

It was not only in the popular writing of the time, however, that the effect of the uprising was felt. It cut athwart the natural growth of serious letters, hastened the development of their realistic tendencies, and left an indelible impress.

From the historical vantage ground of to-day some of the unfortunate results of forced development are apparent. An undisturbed unfolding of innate talent, though no absolute assurance against sickly and ephemeral outgrowths, may have yielded happier and more permanent products. As

it happened, foreign branches were propagated upon a parent German stem, and there grew side by side with the less gratifying fruits others of exceptional size and beauty, the more luxuriant for the grafting.

That was the situation, which must be kept in mind in perusing the succeeding pages that take into account primarily the noisy and salient features of the literary conflict. It will be of interest to note first the status of the drama, the chief concern of this treatise, during the seventies, the decade prior to the upheaval.

Richard Wagner (1813–1883), in whom German romanticism achieved a brillant, though somewhat belated, culmination, is probably the most considerable figure in the German drama since Goethe. The romanticists had perceived what they had believed to be the essential relation between music and poetry. This thesis Wagner was to demonstrate by adding dramatic depth to the traditional opera and by incorporating music into the literary drama. Wagner wrote his libretto, then elaborated, deepened, and completed it by composing a musical accompaniment. Neither the text nor the music was in itself an end. They were means toward a combined effect, toward a higher unity, which for want of a better term has been designated music-drama.

It was not until the seventies, although the greater part of his work had been done about twenty years earlier, that Wagner attained the recognition he deserved. Without considering to what extent Wagner's music-dramas did or did not reflect the spirit of the time, the fact remains that the success of his genius, as will be noted directly, was the one redeeming feature of the German stage during this decade.

The literary drama was at an ebb. Germany was experiencing a cultural revolution; it was the time of the so-called "Gründerjahre," of the pursuit of wealth and luxury. The

circus, the operetta, and vaudeville competed all too successfully with the drama of the purely literary type.

To offset the dearth [1] of home production, the German theaters opened their doors to foreign plays. At Vienna and Leipsic the French *pièce des moeurs* was introduced to the public, with the result that Scribe, Sardou, Augier, and Dumas *fils* soon occupied the stage.

Beginning with *La Dame aux Camélias*, 1852, Dumas *fils* (1824–1895) had written a series of plays dealing with *monde* and *demi-monde*. The unscrupulous upper circles of Paris in their luxury and moral turbidity were contrasted with the fallen women and adulteresses in their unmerited misfortune. The plays were skillfully wrought, witty in dialogue, and replete with esprit.

Conceding that the *pièce des moeurs* was, perhaps, morally detrimental, it had at least two commendable and far reaching influences upon the German drama, not to mention the dramatic literature of the rest of Europe. It extended the scope of subject matter. It taught not a little in technique. In theory naturalistic, the play of manners prepared the way for naturalism proper.

The creative work in the German drama immediately arising out of the French influence unfortunately embodied all the weaknesses of the models conjoined to additional shortcomings of its own. Nowhere were the excellencies of the well-made play attained.

The situation is best exposed in the dramatic writings of Paul Lindau (1839–). The disreputable social circles are presented as respectable. Frivolity abounds. The objectionable is suggested. Cheap wit and citations for effect are characteristic. Questions of the day, though alluded to, play

[1] Ludwig Anzengruber was, as yet, no factor in theater life. If he was known, the stage remained indifferent to him.

no intrinsic part in the dramas. In general, however, Lindau grows more realistic; in his *Maria and Magdalene*, 1872, there is a suggestion of Sudermann's *Magda* (*Heimat*), 1893. The way for the new movement was being prepared.

The unnatural and degenerate condition of the drama was corroborated by the art of the theater. The plays of Goethe and of Schiller were still presented out of a feeling of propriety, or for the purpose of offering some traveling "star" a rôle in which he might appear to advantage. Anything not conducive to an immediate outward effect was eliminated without scruples of any kind. There seemed to be no desire to enter into the spirit of the masterpieces.

The theater managers blocked admittance to the more ambitious dramatists. Rarely did plays that rose above the *niveau* of mediocrity attain a sympathetic presentation.

This quite deplorable picture was relieved by a single high light. In 1874, the court players of the Duke of Meiningen began to tour Germany with the staging at Berlin of Shakespere's *Julius Cæsar*. Their purpose was to recreate the spirit of each individual drama, employing for this purpose the available means of modern staging and presentation. Conscientious veracity was observed in the minutest details. The older and best known plays were supplied with a new charm; instead of detracting from them, the elaborate settings enhanced their effectiveness.

The actors were compelled to place themselves at the disposal of the work of art. There were no "stars." Each actor was prepared to play any rôle assigned to him, no matter if it was the stellar rôle or the most insignificant one in the drama.

That the plays of Shakspere and of Schiller profited most by the Meininger system is obvious. Fortunately, however, the Meininger did not confine themselves to the traditionally

accepted classics; Ibsen, Björnson, and other moderns were not excluded from the repertory.

Thus, as before in the history of German literature, conditions were such that an impulse from without seemed imperative to reanimate indigenous production. Ernst von Wildenbruch (1845–1909), who must receive attention later, failed to rise above the epigonous literature of his day. Ludwig Anzengruber (1839–1889) remained comparatively unknown; he was, furthermore, soon overtaken by the new naturalistic school and left behind. The rejuvenation of the German drama was postponed until Zola, Tolstoy, and, above all, Henrik Ibsen loomed large upon the literary horizon.

Émile Zola (1840–1892), in *Mes haines*, defines a work of art as a part of nature seen athwart a temperament: "*Une œuvre d'art est un coin de la création vu à travers un tempérament.*" There is nothing revolutionary or particularly new in this definition. In fact it was not Zola's purpose to be new, but, rather, to be consistent. Truth, to make the most of truth, was his motto and aim. That which tends to truth he considered good. Of the thousands of pages he wrote, he withdrew nothing. If they have certain vices, he hoped these might do good in serving as a lesson. Zola opposed classicism and romanticism with equal vigor, ascribing to both the decoration of the truth, though each in its own manner. Truth needs no decoration.

It was Zola's endeavor to portray the general and fundamental characteristics of humanity. He worked to reproduce mankind in its totality. Heredity and environment (milieu) explain existence; they are the thread that leads mathematically from one individual in society to the other.

Although Balzac (1799–1850) and Flaubert (1821–1880), as forerunners, had unconsciously incorporated the teachings of Darwin into literature, Zola was the first to do

so purposely. Up to this time a writer would have presented without scruples any individual entirely separate from his forbears and his surroundings. The teaching of free-will had purported nothing more nor less than that each individual chose and directed his own career in life. If the education and the environment of a character were described, it was primarily because that character had to be born and grow up some place, because he had to have a mother and a father, very likely, some neighbors and acquaintances, perchance, an aunt or an uncle.

Now this was changed. Experiment and observation, the essentials of natural science, became the method of literary production. A part, a section, of actuality was chosen as the object of the investigation, and registered in detail. Everything was considered of equal importance; nothing escaped. Literature was endued with a new seriousness and veracity; it was to be more than entertainment for moments, or hours, of leisure.

In his practice, however, Zola did not confine himself within the limits of his theories. Imagination and fancy are not wanting. Symbolism enters as the unifying element. Thus, although adverse to romanticism, Zola is akin to it.

Zola's "experimental" novels (*les romans expérimentaux*) became known in Germany early in the eighties, and subsequently they exerted a great influence both in theory and practice. Their popularity, on the other hand, was of short duration only; it was eclipsed by the works of the Russians, of Leo Tolstoy (1828–1910) and Feodor Dostoevski (1821–1881).

Tolstoy was most concerned with the question of life,—the question which neither science nor art had answered. For such intelligence as left the great problem unsolved, the Russian thinker had little reverence and less respect. In the

faith of the masses Tolstoy rediscovered man's relation to the Infinite. But faith had grown old and feeble except among the simple folk, among the toilers and laborers. Among them only, therefore, could life still have significance.

Like Rousseau, Tolstoy would return to nature, where, freed from the limitations of education, culture, and caste, of personal possession and wealth, man might again behold God's creature in his fellow being. Far from the city, where all evils of modern civilization are augmented, where passion of greed, of power, of desire, efface the image and likeness of Deity, must man live and learn to help his fellow man. No need then of state or church.

It was not the individual himself who solicited Tolstoy's interest; to him there was no hero. The existence of the mass, life in its totality, its elementary and impersonal aspects, was the matter of importance. The relation of one happening to another, the inter-relation of man and occurrences, of man and man,— this became the theme and content of Tolstoy's art.

Tolstoy made preparations for a new dispensation opposed, on the one hand, to current positivism and natural-scientific philosophy, on the other, to established theology. Like Ibsen, the Russian prophet demanded a profound revolution in the practical, the social intercourse of humankind. Then, alone, could the sun of a brighter and better *Weltanschauung* renew the earth.

Dostoevski's interests were similar to those of his compatriot, embracing the social, the political, ethical, æsthetic, and religious activities of man. All the great problems that agitated Europe at the time are to be found in Dostoevski. He had a passion for ideas.

Like Zola, Dostoevski painted in detail, though the milieu remained subordinate to the psychological analysis of char-

acter. In these psychological labyrinths of character and in his sincere sympathy for the proletariat are to be found the explanation of his especial appeal to the Germans.

As Zola had given way to them, the Russians now receded before the Scandinavians, Björnstjerne Björnson (1832–1910) and Henrik Ibsen (1828–1906.)

CHAPTER II

BJÖRNSTJERNE BJÖRNSON

BJÖRNSTJERNE BJÖRNSON, except in Norway, has fared the way of most individuals, who, appearing on the eve of a new epoch, are overshadowed, perhaps entirely absorbed, by the great representative personality in which the epoch seems to culminate or crystallize. Like Christopher Marlowe, Björnson came too soon; he was thus denied the psychological moment which his compatriot was destined to profit by. Therefore, although a leader [1] in the treatment of many new subjects, it was not for Björnson to stamp directly with his impress the general dramatic literature of his day.

The romantic movement in Scandinavia,— the luxuriance and sonority of Oehlenschläger (1779–1850), the elegance and grace of Henrik Hertz (1798–1870), had engaged Northern sympathy and interest to such a degree that its influence remained potent long after the middle of the century. The natural bent for the simple and primitive had been enfeebled, even perverted, to such an extent that the newer literature, which purposed a return to the common, real, and actual thoughts and experiences, met with violent opposition. The current romantic and poetic taste seemed indelible.

[1] Compare *The Newly-Married Couple* (1865) with Ibsen's *A Doll's House* (1878) and *Rosmersholm* (1886). Also, *A Bankruptcy* (1875) with Ibsen's *Pillars of Society* (1877), *An Enemy of the People* (1882), *John Gabriel Borkman* (1896); Becque's *The Ravens* (1882); Mirbeau's *Business is Business* (1903); Barker's *The Voysey Inheritance* (1905).

In those days (after 1850) the liberal party of the three Scandinavian countries was favorably inclined to the peasant in literature, that is, to the peasant in the abstract, hence any literature celebrating him was certain of a cordial reception. The concrete peasant was still generally unknown.

The educated classes of the larger cities had, moreover, gradually grown too critical to accept the extravagances of romanticism *in toto*. There was, without doubt, even a weariness of the highly refined emotional and intellectual life of the past age. Also to these circles of society, therefore, the peasant literature in its novelty and charm made an appeal.

Björnson was peculiarly adapted to expound the life of the peasant classes. As a man of intellect and sentiment, he was consciously their superior only in his artistic genius. He shared their views of human life. In *Synnöve Solbakken* (1857) and in *Arne* (1858), for example, the Norwegian people rediscovered their own characteristic traits and yearnings. In remarkable artistry these short stories combined lyric and idyllic features with others of commonplace and blunt reality. Thus was provided a natural and acceptable step toward the developing literary method of realism.

Björnson's tales of peasant life were followed by lyric poetry and dramatic writings. The earlier dramas, beginning with *Between the Battles* (1857), deal with historic subject matter. They are characterized by their poetry, rather than by any technical perfection.

In 1865, however, in *The Newly-Married Couple* (*De Nygifte*) the dramatist seized upon a theme directly out of the actual modern conditions which surrounded him. The characters which he portrays are of the poet's own time, of his own sphere of culture. Although not entirely successful, the undertaking was a bold and significant one.

The motive which Björnson chose was as interesting as it was original. It was nothing more nor less than the psychological study of the experiences of a young woman who leaves the home of her parents for that of her husband, in short, the transformation from daughter to wife. The theme was not free from hazard, and the treatment of it presented difficulties enough, especially in a time which was accustomed to feel that poetry should keep itself aloof from the everyday.

At this time Björnson was still sufficiently a child of his age to be satisfied with a poetic generalization. The suppressed and indirect treatment of the subject, discarded as *passé* to-day, served then to enlist the sympathy of the public. There is really not much of an attempt to adequately unravel the individual psychological problems which the theme offers. The dialogue, too, removes the play from reality. Yet in spite of the conventions and concessions, the little play was a discreet beginning.

Early in the 'seventies a new literary movement began in Denmark which quickly spread into Norway. Sören Kierkegaard (1813–1855) had filled the air with ideas of psychologic experiment, observation, and essay. Now Herbert Spencer, Darwin, John Stuart Mill, Hippolyte Taine, Max Müller, current on the continent at least a decade earlier, entered the intellectual, literary, and religious life of the receptive Norwegians. Björnson's earlier inclination toward realism received an emphatic support and impetus. He determined to embody the new thought in dramatic form. His first success in the *social drama* was *The Editor* (1874), a rather uncertain and encumbered product of the new order. The next endeavor, *A Bankruptcy*, 1875, was far more successful.[2]

[2] The third great dramatist of the North, August Strindberg, puts the situation concisely:

A Bankruptcy was the first attempt in Scandinavian literature to expose the domestic life of a family and to detect a dramatic conflict in everyday existence. It was entirely new for a dramatist to deal seriously with the common-place theme of business and finance. Although dismissed by the critics of the time, the play experienced a speedy success not only in Scandinavia, but in other European countries as well.

Unless Ibsen's drama of political satire, *The League of Youth* (1869), be included in the list of *social dramas*, there is no question that Björnson anticipated his rival by two dramas of this nature, at least. *The League of Youth*, moreover, was not a little influenced by *The Newly-Married Couple*. The story of Ibsen's and Björnson's reciprocal influence is a remarkable phenomenon in the history of the modern drama. It was usually the latter's versatile and enthusiastic mind that made a new discovery which the former's severe and persistent mentality perfected.[3]

After 1877, the year in which Ibsen's *Pillars of Society* appeared, the growing vogue of Ibsen almost completely inundated Björnson although he continued to produce dramatic literature which posterity will enjoy for a long time to

"In fact in these two plays, *The Editor* and *A Bankruptcy*, the modern drama was ushered into Scandinavia,— and presented with a vigor which entailed certain annihilation to all Beaux-esprits. The plays were rockets which ascended into the clear heavens to call forth volleys, the echo of which we have not yet forgotten.

Björnson had interpreted his rôle seriously; he had hoped to carry on the strife in earnest. But the public had accustomed itself to be amused by its poets, and did not want to hear them preach. People liked, at that time, to make beautiful verses about liberty and the rights of mankind, but it was the beautiful verses, not the cause itself, in which the people found satisfaction." (Strindberg: *Björnstjerne Björnson; Freie Bühne*, 1891, p. 215. See Appendix, p. 173.)

[3] Thus *Between the Battles* furnished the clue for *The Vikings at Helgeland*. Then, although *The League of Youth* exerted no mean influence upon *The Editor* and *A Bankruptcy*, the latter gave the impulse to Ibsen's first effective social drama, *The Pillars of Society*.

come. Björnson's significance in the modern drama seems at present to suffer from a temporary eclipse. An objective and analytical, in short, an historical, judgment will be likely to assign to him a higher place in the annals of dramatic art than is usually admitted.

In Germany Björnson's career in many ways duplicated that at home. His short novels, which had become very popular, opened the way for the dramas.

In the spring of 1873, antedating any performance of Ibsen about two years, the court players of the Duke of Meiningen presented the one act play *Between the Battles.*[4] The critic, Karl Frenzel, whose attitude toward the coming art, as will be noted hereafter, seemed to be one of constant antagonism, conceded to this play the charm, the fresh and effective originality of the author's prose tales.[5]

Since Frenzel's criticisms will be met with not infrequently, a brief statement of his position here at the outset will require no justification.

Before and during the seventies Karl Frenzel was looked upon as the high priest of theater criticism in Berlin, and for a number of years later he remained if not *the*, at least *an* authority. In 1877, he published his *Berliner Dramaturgie*, a compilation of critical articles which had appeared in the Berlin *Nationalzeitung* since 1862. In his critique Frenzel is to some degree a supporter of realism; he sees in realism the only possible basis from which the theater may rise.[6] The significance of the comedy, for example, must be intensified; it must become, it was his opinion, more and more a mirror of the time. That was the day's problem of the dramatist.

[4] *Zwischen den Schlachten,* 1857.
[5] *Deutsche Rundschau* 6, 1876; p. 138.
[6] Frenzel: *Berliner Dramaturgie* I, p. 131.

Lindau's *Maria and Magdalene*, to cite an illustration, was noted with approval because the play reflects modern life:

> Paul Lindau is sensible of modern existence. He stands in the midst of the present movements and struggles. If he is deficient in the ability to penetrate to the sources of these currents, their cause and essence, he has, to compensate for this lack, the talent to seize, quickly and readily, the most conspicuous phenomena, the foibles and mistakes of society . . .[7]

Though commending Lindau's theme, Frenzel seriously objected[8] to the treatment of it. Relating the dramatic conflict, rather than presenting it on the stage, was, in the critic's opinion, an undue imposition upon the credulity of an audience. The intrusion of epic elements in the drama Frenzel consistently opposed. Nor could he reconcile himself to another tendency of the time, namely, the inclination, as it was interpreted, of transforming the theater into an educational establishment (*Erziehungsanstalt*).

In 1875, *The Newly-Married Couple* and *A Bankruptcy*[9] were staged at Berlin. Frenzel, in the *Deutsche Rundschau*, his critical organ, expresses the opinion that these dramas did not fulfill expectations. Referring to the latter one, he admits that everything presented is true, but unfortunately also commonplace, a sketch "grey in grey."[10]

Paul Lindau in *Die Gegenwart*,[11] on the other hand, ascribes to the drama the deepest and most overwhelming impression that anything on the stage had effected in years. In the same volume of Lindau's magazine[12] *The Newly-Mar-*

[7] Frenzel: *Berliner Dramaturgie* I, p. 317. See Appendix, p. 173.
[8] Ibid, p. 318.
[9] *Die Neuvermählten*, 1865; *Ein Fallissement*, 1874.
[10] *Deutsche Rundschau* 6, 1876; p. 138.
[11] *Die Gegenwart* 8, 1875; p. 369.
[12] *Die Gegenwart* 8, 1875; p. 91.

ried Couple receives favorable comment as an ingenious and finely drawn composition successful to a high degree in captivating the audience. The psychological mood and analysis, the penetrating character portrayal, the success with which the psychological interest compensates for and replaces external action are recognized as commendable factors.

By 1886 both plays had been included in the repertory of all the leading theaters.[13] Thus they served to turn the gaze of the young literary generation northward from whence their great teacher was to come. *A Bankruptcy* was the frail beginning of the new drama which burst forth with full force in Ibsen.[14]

[13] Moritz Necker: *Björnstjerne Björnson; Die Grenzboten,* 1886, 3; p. 316.

[14] In a prospectus sent to the members of the Free Theater at Berlin, Björnson's *Gauntlet* was listed for the sixth performance of the first year:

Henrik Ibsen	*Ghosts*
Gerhart Hauptmann	*Before Dawn*
Edmond and Jules de Goncourt	*Henriette Maréchal*
Count Leo Tolstoy	*The Powers of Darkness*
Ludwig Anzengruber	*The Fourth* (in English the *Fifth*) *Commandment*
Björnstjerne Björnson	*A Gauntlet*
Arthur Fitger	*By Grace of Heaven*
August Strindberg	*The Father*

(See Otto Brahm: *Kritische Schriften,* pp. 251, 252).

The actual order of presentation:

Sept. 29, Ibsen	*Ghosts*
Oct. 20, Hauptmann	*Before Dawn*
Nov. 17, Goncourt	*Henriette Maréchal*
Dec. 15, Björnson	*A Gauntlet*

(Frenzel: *Deutsche Rundschau* 62, 1890; p. 316).

Björnson's strong impression at the beginning of the new movement was repeated toward the close of the period by his drama *Beyond Human Power,* 1896. The excitement it engendered Witkowski (*Das deutsche Drama,* p. 112) would attribute to the theme rather than to any direct merit of the play itself.

CHAPTER III

IBSEN IN GERMANY DURING THE SEVENTIES

AFTER having experienced a number of years of continued adversity, Ibsen, at the age of thirty-six, left his native country (April, 1864) and settled in Rome. Here he sojourned four years in solitude, recognized by few, known — one might almost say — by none. Otto Brahm, in an early essay, sketches a vivid portrait of the great dramatist at this period:

When I arrived in Rome last spring, I was to deliver greetings to Henrik Ibsen. The undertaking met with the unexpected difficulty that the dwelling of the poet could not be located; neither the Rome directory, which knows little, nor the foreign quarter of the city, which knows everything, could supply the information. To be sure, it was said that Ibsen had been living in Rome for a number of years; occasionally he was seen walking along the Corso, alone in the crowd; but no one had daily converse with him, no one had caught a glimpse of his lodging. At last I was informed that the poet, with inexorable regularity, visited the Café Aranjo at seven o'clock each evening. I stepped in, and having given an approximate description, received the confirmation that he, whom I was seeking, was a daily guest at the place. He must be a German, I was told, many Germans greet him, though none speaks with him. He always sits alone at his table.

Meanwhile Ibsen approached,— a man of medium height and strong physique, a head of decided energy and severity, of a type which might have aroused the imaginative faculty of Michael Angelo. An abundance of gray hair rises from a

forehead fully rounded by intellectual labor. Spectacles do not conceal the small blue-grey eyes which look about with keen observation and seem to pierce through the exterior into the very soul of things. A slight smile plays about the thin lips, which cautiously contract. The spreading beard is cut in English fashion and lends to the determined head a characteristic finality.

An acquaintance was quickly established, and soon I discovered from the poet himself how profoundly the loneliness of his existence is grounded in his view of life. With his *Enemy of the People* Ibsen speaks: "The strongest man in the world is he who stands (most) alone." [1]

In the atmosphere which had inspired Goethe in his work on *Iphigenie* and *Tasso*, Ibsen completed his *Brand*, which Emanuel Brunn would describe as a "work of the most rugged type, pervaded with protestant ideas and replete with the categorical imperative. But in the midst of the forces of an unyielding will, the poet placed the wife and mother Agnes, as doomed and helpless as a stray butterfly among the frightful mountain wastes of Norway,— a poetic figure, as Imogen or Gretchen, of the first rank." [2]

Quitting Rome, Ibsen passed three months in the Alps, then proceeded northward to Dresden, where, on a tour in the interests of theatrical art, in 1852, he had spent two months to acquaint himself with the German theater. While living in Dresden, the dramatist became a member of a literary club which he attended without taking part, save rarely, in the discussions. His small circle of associates included Count Wolf Baudissin and Hermann Hettner. But Ibsen considered friends a luxury which he could hardly afford, so

1 Brahm: *Deutsche Rundschau* 49, 1886; p. 193. See appendix, pp. 173, 174.

2 Brunn: *Magazin f. d. Lit. d. Auslandes* 99, 1881, I; pp. 73, 74. Appendix, pp. 174, 175.

he continued to lead his habitual existence in solitude and seclusion.

In the spring of 1875, more than ten years after his voluntary exile, Ibsen with his family moved to Munich, which remained his home, excepting the intervals of 1878–79 and 1881–85, until 1891. His external appearance now underwent a change. The poet who formerly dressed in a velvetine jacket became the gentleman of affairs in a frock coat. The previous life of a recluse was not discontinued; yet Ibsen grew more sociable, not only associating with his countrymen, but also with various German artists, among them Wilhelm Hertz and Paul Heyse.

It was at Munich that the dramatist revolted against the poetic style of his earlier works and turned to the reproduction of actual life. *The Pillars of Society* issued forth as the first product of the new regimen.

It had been Ibsen's expectation to create with the new play a great deal of excitement and discussion, but he was doomed to disappointment. Danish taste pronouned *The Pillars of Society* too German.[3] Such criticism may in part account for the relative coolness with which the play was received in Norway, where German political and cultural influences had always been more or less protested.

Ibsen himself entertained no slight aversion toward Germany; Prussia, in the unequal struggle with Denmark, with which his youthful and sanguine sympathy rested, particularly kindled his ire. By 1870 this personal hatred had quite abated. Still, in the political policy and expansion of the North German Kingdom, Ibsen beheld the foe to an early realization of his ideal. He wrote to Georg Brandes (Dresden, December 20, 1870):

[3] Cf. Edmund Gosse: *Henrik Ibsen,* Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1907.

The old illusory France has collapsed. As soon as the actual Prussia does the same, we shall be, with one bound, in the genesis of a new age. How ideas will tumble down about us! And in truth it is time. Up to the present we have been living on nothing but the crumbs from the revolutionary table of the last century, and that fare has been chewed and sufficiently chewed again. The old concepts are in need of renovation. Liberty, equality, and fraternity are no longer the same things they were in the days of the late guillotine. That is what the politicians will not understand, and therefore I hate them. They want revolutions only in externals, in the realm of politics, etc. But all that is nonsense. The important thing is the revolt of man's spiritual self.[4]

Such was the man whose versatility was to contribute to youthful Germany, as a unit and in dramatic form, what the French and Russian authors had offered separately (the detailed portrayal of milieu, the minute analysis of psychological phenomena). He was the one to aid *Jüngst Deutschland* most in recreating order out of chaos, the *Götterdämmerung* of what had been and the inauguration of what was to be, of which each seer of the century had had a different vision.[5]

The first of Ibsen's writings to appear in German were his lyric poems, published by a certain Edmund Lobedanz in *An Album of North Germanic Poetry*,[6] Leipsic, 1868. Apparently they received no attention at this time. Two years earlier, John Grieg, brother of the composer had attempted to put *The Pretenders*[7] into German iambics.[8] The trans-

[4] *Breve fra Henrik Ibsen* I. Appendix, p. 175.

[5] For a brief and excellent comparison of Zola, Tolstoy, Dostoevski, and Ibsen consult Soergel: *Dichtung und Dichter der Zeit*, pp. 156, 157.

[6] *Album nordgermanischer Dichtung.*

[7] Done into English, 1890; into French, 1893; into Russian, 1896.

[8] Concerning *The Pretenders* in verse, see Ibsen's letters to John Grieg, from Rome, March 22, 1866; and to Michael Birkeland, from Rome, May 4, 1866.

lation found no publisher. A similar fate awaited Siebold's translation [9] of *Brand*,[10] made in 1869, until 1872. During that year, however, *The Pretenders* and *The League of Youth* [11] also issued from the German press.

Brand immediately enlisted the greatest interest among translators; in 1874, a second translation appeared, two years later, a third. The tense dramatic scenes of the "dramatic poem" were admired, but any thought of presenting it on the stage was dismissed as infeasible.[12]

Of interest is the first comment on *The Pretenders* and *The League of Youth* on account of its mild conservatism and reserve:

> *The Pretenders* is a daring play of great vitality, of wealth in ideas, and of a beautiful diction; and we could easily imagine its success, were it skillfully arranged for our stage. An equally favorable prognostication we would not dare to make for the second play, *The League of Youth*. It deals with the political machinery of the day. Although many of its characters are to be found among us, the conditions portrayed are too foreign to us to engender any lively interest in them in spite of all the recognition due the structure and the language of the play.[13]

In 1873, Adolf Strodtmann, the translator of *The Pretenders* and *The League of Youth*, in a volume entitled *The Intellectual Life in Denmark* utters this prophecy: "It will not be long before the fame of the poet will resound over the furthermost lands." [14]

[9] Concerning Siebold's *Brand*, see Ibsen's letter to Frederik Hegel, from Dresden, March 14, 1869. Cf. *Breve fra H. I.*, I, p. 319.

[10] Appeared in English, 1891; in French, 1895.

[11] Appeared in English, 1890; in French, 1893; in Russian, 1896.

[12] J. H.: *Mag. f. d. Lit. d. Auslandes* 86, 1874, 2; p. 454 ff.

[13] J. H.: *Henrik Ibsen, ein norwegischer Dramatiker; Magazin f. d. Lit. d. Auslandes* 82, 1872, 2; p. 367 ff. Appendix, pp. 175, 176.

[14] *Das geistige Leben in Dänemark.* Cf. Arnold: *Das moderne Drama*, pp. 148, 149.

Strodtmann's book was reviewed by H. Rückert in the *Grenzboten* of the same year, under the title, *Recent Endeavors to a Mutual Understanding between Germany and Denmark.*[15] After a rather prolonged discussion of the unfriendly attitude of the two countries toward each other,—their once existing intimacy had been disrupted by the war of 1864 — the reviewer concludes that the volume in question affords almost sufficient proof that Denmark can offer modern Germany little, at any rate, little that is wholesome or beneficial. The detailed analysis of the modern Danish writers,[16] whom the Germans do not comprehend anyway, Rückert finds regrettable and would have preferred a history of the development of the cultural life in Denmark, specifically Copenhagen.

The antagonistic view to which Rückert gives voice is representative of no small number of critics and literati whose nationalism obscures a purely æsthetic judgment. Yet even with nationalism excluded,— it goes without saying — unimpassioned observation is practically impossible at the threshold of a new era. Each time is repeated the "battle of the books," with the victory foreordained to the new.

Thus, another student of literature, though regretting the step-motherly way in which Björnson is disposed of, commends Strodtmann's volume to all who would acquaint themselves with Danish conditions.[17]

The court theater at Meiningen introduced Ibsen to the German stage in 1875, with the presentation of *The Pretenders.* The play was retained in the repertory for subsequent production and was staged at Berlin, in June, 1876.

15 *Neueste deutsch-dänische Verständigungsversuche; Grenzboten* 1873, *2*, II; p. 253 ff.

16 Wergeland, Welhaven, Björnson, Ibsen.

17 W. L.: *Mag. f. d. Lit. d. Auslandes* 84, 1873, *2*; p. 462 ff. Strodtmann dedicates 3 pages to Björnson, *55* to the "no wise greater Ibsen."

Karl Frenzel in the *Deutsche Rundschau* gives a brief review of the performance. According to him, the poet does not lack effective diction, dramatic movement, talent to create characteristic personalities; but, on the other hand, he is too deficient in dramatic construction, in the ability in a simple manner to dispose of powerful masses and to work a plot out properly. Upon the German audience, to the temper and nationality of which the play does not appeal, *The Pretenders* has the effect of a *Staatsaction.*

> It is a waste of time, money, and endeavor, to exert oneself to present plays, which, in spite of their poetic value, never can be naturalized upon the German stage because of their fundamental attributes, which are foreign to us for all time.[18]

The scenes in their variety and abundance were the objects of praise. The phases of the work peculiarly Ibsenian, — his tendency to subjectivize his theme, seemed to be disturbing. Although performed in Berlin several times, in Munich and in Schwerin, *The Pretenders* was fated to leave hardly a trace except the memory of the author's name.

In April of 1876, *The Vikings at Helgeland* was presented at Munich, in October of the same year at Vienna and Dresden. Nothing I have been able to find indicates that these performances occasioned any particular enthusiasm or discussion. That the drama, however, must have aroused some interest and approval seems to be warranted by the fact that afterwards it continued to appear occasionally in the repertories of both court and municipal theaters.

Two years passed. Then, in 1878, five theaters [19] at Berlin presented *The Pillars of Society* [20] within a fortnight,

[18] Frenzel: *Deutsche Rundschau* 8, 1876; p. 154. Appendix, p. 176.
[19] Cf. Table B, p. 139.
[20] First played at Odense, then at Copenhagen, Nov. 18, 1877; Bergen,

success without parallel in the annals of Berlin theaters. Frenzel could not repress his displeasure.

If native productions are to be consigned to the ash heap, and foreign literature fostered, it is Frenzel's opinion, a national drama is out of the question. In view of the mass of foreign material with which German literature is inundated, in view of the exaggerated praise the former receives, Frenzel is surprised that native authors are to be found writing at all.

Turning to Ibsen's plays, he finds the "lion's paw of the poet everywhere, the born dramatist nowhere. The lyric and epic elements outweigh the dramatic structure of the compositions to such a degree that a performance of them is not to be considered at all without a most reckless application of the blue pencil." [21]

The Pillars of Society is a novel, by main force put into dramatic form. That is the reason the exposition continues into the third act, and a single act suffices for the deed of the hero. And this deed, characteristic of Ibsen, is a long speech. When the epic writer leaves the stage, the rhetorician enters.

Ibsen's play has the irrefutable purpose of presenting the flimsy morality of those who are fond of posing as the pillars of society. As such, it is unusually effective and a cutting censure of social conditions as they are. In conclusion, Frenzel reiterates that Ibsen is, of course, a poet, but no dramatist.

Nov. 30, 1877; Stockholm, Dec. 13, 1877; Kristiania (in Swedish), March 7, 1879; Munich, Residenztheater, Feb. 5, 1878; Vienna, Stadttheater Laubes, Feb. 22, 1878. During the same year in 25 other theaters in Germany and Austria; London, Dec. 15, 1880; New York, German Theater, Dec., 1889; Rome, Jan., 1893; Paris, June, 1896. Reich (*Ibsens Dramen,* p. 185) concludes that *The Pillars of Society* established Ibsen's international reputation.

21 Frenzel: *Deutsche Rundschau* 14, 1878; p. 485. Appendix, p. 176.

The purely theatrical aspects of the play had a striking effect upon the audience. If not in general as agreeably acceptable as Björnson's *Bankruptcy*,[22] *The Pillars of Society* engendered a greater excitement,— which was, however, only transient for the immediate public.[23] The play, on account of its popularity, served to prepare the way for its successor.

In passing, the first presentation of *Lady Inger of Östråt*, in the same year (1878), must receive mention.

During the second half of the decade, four plays were translated: *The Vikings at Helgeland*,[24] 1876;[25] *Lady Inger of Östråt*, 1877;[26] *The Pillars of Society*, 1878;[27] *A Doll's House*,[28] 1879.[29] The "Reclam Universalbibliothek"

[22] Björnson's play deals with an individual occurrence which, though frequent enough, leaves society as a whole intact. The *Pillars of Society* shows the intimate relation between the individual and his community, and thus exposes the weaknesses in the latter as well as those in the former. In *A Bankruptcy* the social equipoise is not disturbed, or, if disturbed, re-establishes itself; in the *P. o. S.*, on the other hand, there seems little hope of restoring it. The further the investigation of society is carried, as in the case of the "Indian Girl," the worse its condition is found to be. The latter is, of course, a far less comfortable analysis of the problem.

[23] Not transient, as will be seen later, for the enthusiasts of the coming drama. Fritz Mauthner, for instance, wrote in the *Deutsches Montageblatt* (Jan., 1878), that the critics might now be satisfied, after weeks of fasting, with this admirable play. In the same article Mauthner makes a comparison between Ibsen and the more celebrated Björnson, who still ranked in the critic's judgment as the greater dramatist. (Cf. Stein: *Henrik Ibsen*, p. 3.)

[24] Under the title *Nordische Heerfahrt*.

[25] *The Vikings* was translated into English, 1890; French, 1893; Russian, 1892.

[26] *Lady Inger* into English, 1890, Russian, 1896.

[27] *The Pillars of Society* into Czech, 1879; English, 1888; Italian, 1892; French, 1893; Dutch, 1893; Russian, 1896.

[28] First known as *Nora*.

[29] *A Doll's House* into English, 1880, Russian, 1882, French, 1889. Also into Portuguese, Polish, Serbian, Croatian, Hungarian, Finnish, Dutch, Italian, and others.

edition of Ibsen's plays was begun by the translation of *The Pillars of Society* (Wilhelm Lange's) just mentioned. This edition became a potent factor in propagating the acquaintance of Ibsen's art and philosophy.

. . . . . .

During the seventies a yearning for a new national drama arose in Germany and grew intense. Quite common was the opinion that it should arise from within, and that the existing preponderance of foreign literature was a detriment. Those who looked beyond the borders of their fatherland were inclined to consider France as the probable source of the new inspiration. A feeling was current that the North in its essential character was foreign to German temper and sympathy, hence that no contribution need be expected from that source.

The seventies were, therefore, as far as Ibsen was concerned, rather impervious. His time was not yet. Though admitted to be a poet, he was not considered a dramatist. His diction was admired. His technique was a subject for debate. *The Pillars of Society* was confused with the familiar *pièce à thèse.*

CHAPTER IV

GATHERING FORCES, 1880–1886

AT its appearance, in 1879, *A Doll's House*[1] had set fire to Scandinavia. The author was reviled; the play denounced as an outrage, an insult to society. Fortunately a few, but brilliant and staunch admirers, among them the Danish critic, Georg Brandes, were at hand to support the author and his play. The excitement in the North hardly had begun when the presentation of the drama at Berlin,[2] in 1880, ignited a second nation. Nor was the conflagration to stop here; it spread over Europe and beyond.

Paul Lindau reviewed the play in *The Gegenwart*.[3] The discussion opens with a trial of Nora Helmer at a civil court. The final verdict is simple forgery without mercenary motives; the sentence, one day's imprisonment.

This incident may serve as an index, as typical, of the unusual and extreme interest of the play immediately commanded. Its predecessor the German public had interpreted as directed against a society not its own, although parallels might have been drawn. But now it felt its own integrity attacked. Debate, often violent, concerned itself with every

[1] *Nora* was first played in Copenhagen, Dec. 21, 1879; then in Stockholm, Jan. 8, 1880; Bergen, Jan. 30, 1880; Helsingfors (Finland), Feb. 25, 1880; Munich, Residenztheater, March 3, 1880; Hamburg; Dresden; Hannover; Berlin, Nov. 22, 1880; Vienna, Stadttheater, Sept. 8, 1881; St. Petersburg, Nov., 1881; Warsaw, Feb., 1882; London, March 3, 1884; then also in Italy, Spain, Belgium, Holland, Hungary, Egypt, Australia, North America. It was the first of Ibsen's plays to win a place in the French repertory, April, 1894.

[2] Not the initial performance in Germany; see note 1, this page.

[3] *Die Gegenwart* 18, 1880; p. 346 ff.

aspect of the drama, the social, the æsthetic, the philosophical. *The Pillars of Society* had been a revolt; *Nora* created a revolution in the thought of the civilized world. And that, by the way, was exactly what Ibsen wanted.

Theater managers and dramatists opposed the new drama with as much vigor as conventional society. It was accidental, the caprice of an actress, that the play was given at all at this time.

Lindau first of all directs his criticism against the plausibility of the motivation. The incident portrayed, in his opinion, might result in a closer and more intimate relation between husband and wife, in the husband's better understanding and greater appreciation of his wife,— in almost anything except in that conclusion that Ibsen draws. The lasting estrangement of the husband and wife, the separation of the mother from her children are impossible.

Lindau is willing to follow the plot, even with warmth and interest, to the point at which the document is no longer threatening. But Ibsen's endeavor to consider this disposed of stumbling block a boulder against which the respectable and peaceful marriage of eight years' duration is wrecked, is incomprehensible to the critic. He shakes his head and the sympathy he has had for the *hero and the heroine* falls forfeit.

As far as Helmer is concerned, everything is explicable and pardonable, except that in his tantrum he allows himself to be brutal, grievously charging Nora with her father's characteristic thoughtlessness. Nora, on the other hand, is unintelligible. She is Helmer's joyful companion; she strews the path of the tormented husband with roses; she furnishes amusement for his leisure hours; she becomes the mother of his children. And is this not a worthy mission for a wife?

Nora does not seem to think so. She is the misunderstood

woman. Her husband is no longer her ideal, and she can, therefore, no longer love him. Because she no longer loves him she is unable to remain under his roof. She scarcely considers her children at all, and when she does, it is with an inconceivable lack of mother-love. If it were not so Nora could not leave them without compunction. Lindau asks if this be credible. Nora may think her action noble; it is not only atrocious, it is unpardonable.

In the middle of the last act, a new play with new characters begins. This, not to mention all the others, is a deplorable error in the composition of the drama. The audience is not sufficiently ductile to follow the dramatist in his complete transformation of the persons. As charming as Nora is as an unobtrusive wife, so repulsive she becomes as a misunderstood woman.

Although there is nothing which is offensive to the public feeling of shame, still the play is more questionable than the coarsest *pièce des moeurs* of the French school. The great poetic talent and eloquence of the author in giving expression to unhealthy feeling and emotion, the reviewer fears, will greatly increase the ranks of the Misunderstood by disturbing the balance of those naturally addicted to this malady. That nonsense should triumph, and reason go down in defeat is the immoral aspect of the situation.

Lindau does not comprehend why the picture need be darkened further by such a character as Dr. Rank. Nor is it clear to him why Fru Linde should insist upon Torwald's knowing the truth of the whole matter.

Still, that the play end with a reconciliation, to which Ibsen, reluctantly enough, acceded in a subsequent version,[2]

[2] Though written expressly for the Berlin actress Frau Hedwig Niemann-Raabe, who declared she could never leave her children, the conciliatory ending was preferred by such leading dramaturgists as Laube

Lindau finds intolerable, because a wrong conclusion from the premises the author accepts.

The review concludes with the somewhat lame admission that Ibsen is a true poet, his language and technic admirable.

It is obvious from Lindau's statements that Ibsen's full originality, which reveals itself in the latter half of the third act, was the main point of contention. As long as the dramatist had continued in the rather orthodox ways of the theater, no protests were occasioned.

Frenzel's interpretation in the *Deutsche Rundschau*[3] in most points coincides with that of Lindau. Still a few remarks may be appended.

Nora is a play which gains the consideration of even those who feel its purpose and form repulsive. The peculiar talent of the author exercises a charm, though Ibsen is by no means

of Vienna and Maurice of Hamburg. Though soon settled for the stage, the problem continued to interest the critics for some time to come. Steiger, for instance, still argues that the original conclusion, though logically correct, is poetically a failure, resembling the logical solution of a chess problem more than the unreasonableness of actual life. (Steiger: *Das Werden des neuen Dramas* I, p. 190.) The lines substituted for the original ending read as follows:

NORA. That our life together would be real wedlock. Good-bye. (*She is about to go.*)

HELMER. (*Takes her by the arm.*) Go, if you must, but see your children for the last time.

NORA. Let me go. I don't want to see them. I cannot.

HELMER. (*Draws her toward the door at the left.*) You must see them. (*Opens the door and says softly:*) Do you see,— there they sleep carefree and quietly. To-morrow when they awaken and call for their mother, they will have none.

NORA. (*Trembling.*) No mother . . .

HELMER. As you have had none.

NORA. No mother! (*Struggles within, lets her bag fall and says:*) Oh, I am sinning against myself, but I cannot leave them. (*She sinks down at the door.*)

HELMER. (*Happy, says softly:*) Nora!

(*The curtain falls.*)

(Appendix, pp. 176, 177.)

[3] *Deutsche Rundschau* 26, 1881; pp. 306, 308 ff.

a master of dramatic form. The long narratives and descriptions, which are supposed to elucidate the intricate and confused plot, the accurate and minute dissection of the human soul, proper enough in a novel,— one of George Eliot's, for example, are tedious and confusing.

Frenzel perceives in the play a purpose to instruct, to offer a subject for serious reflection. What does Ibsen want to prove in *Nora?* That the laws that punish forgery are unjust? The laws are entirely just, and an imprisonment of a day's or of a week's duration, to which Nora would have been consigned, without the slightest blot to her honor, were insignificant to the tortures she endures through three acts. If the author, however, meant to portray in Nora a great misunderstood woman, to reveal the secret sorrow of a family externally happy, he has failed in his impression as far as the critic is concerned.

The tragic hero succumbs to the moral law, he does not violate it. Nora reverses the conception of duty. Yet the greatest error lies in the incongruity of the two phases of Nora's nature. Whoever thinks as Nora does in the last act is incapable of being the Nora in the first act.

Thus *A Doll's House* was a failure in every particular. The actors were unsuccessful, and one might apply the same term to public and critic. Georg Brandes sadly remarked that Ibsen would never be understood in Germany.[4]

One man only, in spite of many other misconceptions, understood Nora's going, and he alone had the courage in the face of general opposition to assert its necessity. This man was Friedrich Spielhagen.[5] Unaccustomed to the increased demands Ibsen exacted from the audience, Spielhagen

[4] Georg Brandes (1842–), the well known Danish critic, resided in Germany, 1877–1883.

[5] Kerr: *Das neue Drama,* p. 28. Also Zabel, *Unsere Zeit,* 1881, 1; p. 530.

felt that an epic treatment of the material would have been preferable. Thus might those elements be made clear that in dramatic form were obscure or ambiguous.

After 1880, translations left the press in great numbers. They were made without consideration of the peculiar artistic excellencies of the original, and without the purpose or the ability to do them justice.

The further fact that Ibsen was first widely known in Germany, and in other countries, as the author of *A Doll's House* and, later, of *Ghosts* was a second significant factor in the extravagant misconceptions of the man, his character, his genius,— misconceptions which were current for several decades, perhaps to the end of the century.

In 1881, Ludwig Passarge's translations of *Peer Gynt* [6] and the *Poems* appeared. In 1883, *An Enemy of the People* [7] was issued in the "Reclam" edition. Although published in 1881, *Ghosts* [8] was not done into German until 1884. To the professional translator, the drama seemed without theatrical prospects of any kind; he had, therefore, conserved his time and energy.

Peer Gynt was coolly received. Ernest Wichert [9] was the first to call attention to the very peculiar and interesting drama, which one must know to speak intelligently about Ibsen. As Goethe had portrayed in *Faust* the incarnation of the unrestricted passion for knowledge, Wichert continues his comment, Ibsen here considers the absolute dominion of phantasy and imagination, which, as the desire for knowledge, are integral factors of human nature. Herein lies the essential interest of the poem.

[6] *Peer Gynt,* into English, 1892; French, 1896; Russian, 1897.

[7] *An Enemy of the People,* into English, 1888; French, 1892; Russian, 1891.

[8] *Ghosts,* into English, 1885, French, 1889; Russian, 1891.

[9] Wichert: *Henrik Ibsen; Im neuen Reich,* 1880, 2; p. 889 ff.

But even the most sanguine admirer of the poet must admit that the poem is ambiguous. It lacks the certain guidance step by step to the height which affords an unobstructed view of the whole. One seems to be in a house of many rooms, each with three or more doors; one is never certain of having chosen the right exit, and in the next room the dilemma is renewed. That urges one on either to understand the intricate plan, or to conclude that it is all nonsense. He who would attempt to establish the unity of the theme, or, vice versa, to prove that no unity exists, would have to write a commentary which might easily comprise a volume. . . .

Even he who regards the whole as a book of seven seals will find scenes of great dramatic power, passages of poetic beauty, clever axioms, in abundance.[10]

Eugen Zabel is even less enthusiastic. *Peer Gynt* is too unreal, too insubstantial to sustain one's sympathy and interest.

Finally, every reader recalls that Peer Gynt is the son of an inebriate father and a mad mother, and begins to assign the problem not to poesy, but to pathology,— where, it is our opinion, it belongs.[11]

A third commentator, Emanuel Brunn,[12] is not prepared to draw an immediate conclusion. Even with devotion and close attention, the reader must not hope to fathom the poem in one perusal.

Peer Gynt, in this respect, resembles certain musical compositions, which only reveal themselves after being heard repeatedly, — a fugue of Bach, or one of Beethoven's last great masterpieces. It required decades to appreciate the *Ninth Symphony.* It must

10 Wichert, *Im neuen Reich,* 1880, *2*; p. 901. Appendix, p. 177.

11 Zabel, *Unsere Zeit,* 1881, 1; p. 527. Appendix, p. 177.

12 Brunn: *Peer Gynt von Henrik Ibsen; Mag. f. d. Lit. d. Auslandes* 99, 1881; p. 73 ff.

not be overlooked that *Fidelio* met with the greatest opposition when first presented; that decades passed before a poet as Heinrich von Kleist received mere mention.[13]

Ibsen was performed little during these years. In 1881, *Nora* was presented at Munich. Critical literature of an appreciative type was the contribution of the half decade.

The first endeavor in Germany to engender an appreciation of the dramatist and his works was an essay (from which has been quoted on the preceding page) by Eugen Zabel, published in *Unsere Zeit*, 1881.[14]

The author of *Nora* is a lion, and as such, disdains to occupy himself with bagatelles. Without being molested the sparrows may alight near him; he does not notice them, while in anger he springs against the door and iron gratings of his prison. It is inexplicable that no one has yet pointed out the similarity between Ibsen's creed and the German pessimism. It is so striking that only blindfolded eyes can fail to see it.

The easiest way to familiarize oneself with Ibsen is to regard him as a lyric poet. Thus an insight is procured into his peculiar genius, which upon the first attempt at acquaintance seems anything but intelligible. All thoughts and feelings seem enveloped in a veil of mist, like the peaks of a mountain range. Occasionally a gust of wind lifts the heavy atmosphere and uncovers definite images and ideas, which are revealed only to be engulfed anew. That is, contemplation plays a far greater rôle in his writings than imagination and emotion. Only with great effort can the latter confine the former within its bounds.

Though Ibsen is in possession of a fertile imagination, it is encircled by a frigid sheath of intellect. Often, however, the intellectual ardor is transmuted into emotional fervor.

13 Ibid, p. 77. Appendix, pp. 177, 178.
14 Zabel: *Henrik Ibsen; Unsere Zeit*, 1881, 1; pp. 513–531.

Thus, although many of his works contain only poetically ornamented concepts, his masterpieces are not wanting in genuine poetry of form and color.

Three periods may be distinguished in Ibsen's career: the national-historical period, with *The Pretenders* at its apex; the romantic-philosophic period, best illustrated by *Brand;* third, the modern social period, exemplified by *Nora.*

For the second group of dramas, Ibsen drew much nourishment from German culture. His contemplative and penetrating earnestness leads him to consider the most difficult problems of humanity with the hope of finding a solution. The strength and magnitude of his characters, the scope of his horizon, are perhaps to be designated as his German heritage. (Ibsen's maternal grandfather was a North German.) *Brand* and *Peer Gynt* were without doubt suggested by Goethe, and, although we are far from placing either one of them in the same class with *Faust,*— as an incomparable work of art — it is not to be denied that they have in common with it, at least the vastness of plan, the wealth of thought, and the incommensurable form, combined with the most powerful poetic revelations of the Germanic spirit.

In 1883, L. Passarge published the first monograph in German on Henrik Ibsen. The importance of the treatise lies primarily in its priority. It was the first tribute to the dramatist to appear in book form (310 pages). Besides an introduction and biography,[15] the volume contains interpretative discussions of Ibsen's chief works, from *Catilina* to *Ghosts* inclusive.

Passarge rates *Brand* and *Peer Gynt* as the author's greatest and most characteristic creations. In the social dramas he sees first, Ibsen's desire to deal with psychological prob-

[15] Also published in the *Mag. f. d. Lit. d. Auslandes* 103, pp. 142 ff., 148 ff.

lems; second, his purpose of holding a mirror before the era. A comparison of Passarge's with the previous comments on *A Doll's House* is sufficient to illustrate the progress made, individually at least, in the apprehension of the poet and his purpose.

When Nora married Torwald Helmer, she passed from her father's hands into those of her husband. The horizon established for her by the former's moral preachments was now widened by the principles of her husband's æsthetics. Both were entirely superficial. The sufferings of others, for example, impressed Torwald not as grievous or sad, but as ugly. Although Nora had lived with him eight years, her husband had never looked upon her as his comrade. He had guided, counseled, protected her, never shared the problems of life with her. Treated as a child she had remained one, not hesitating at childish expedients. If advantageous to her, she would prevaricate,— naïvely, irresponsibly. The falsehoods never concerned anything of importance and were not, as her husband would think, indications of questionable morality. (Here Passarge touches upon a point which became the topic of prolific and heated discussions not entirely confined to the drawing room.)

Nora catches the first glimpse of the moral significance of her falsehoods when Torwald relates, in connection with Krogstad's past, of the demoralizing consequences of a lie. Nora cannot comprehend the conventional honor in regard to which her husband is so sensitive. Hence at the crisis she can expect the "wonder of wonders" to happen. Then to take all upon herself, to make the great sacrifice, is her womanly but genuine and deeply tragic logic. Before it, man is helpless, perplexed, even absurd. Nora's sacrifice is dependent upon an original sacrifice on the part of her husband. This affords her the essential strength and courage.

His failure is her failure.

And Torwald does fail. The expected great "wonder" does not come to pass. Nora is disillusioned. She realizes that she no more loves her husband, that what had seemed as a marriage had never been a marriage. She cannot return to the past. She recognizes her incapacity to rear her children; she herself must be brought up. Torwald can be of no assistance to her. She must leave him. Nora's original sacrifice for her husband had been the first step in her further development. As she in secret and alone paid the debt through her own work and economy, her independent self unfolded.

According to Passarge, Nora's guilt lies in deceiving her husband, in applying the money designed for her needs to the payment of the loan. Nora plays the coquette with Dr. Rank in order to get the needed sum for the final payment from him, and is kept from compromising herself only by a casual remark of his. Her will is thereby strengthened, but her character morally weakened.

Torwald is the egotist. Nora is to him not only the one whom he loves, but the one who amuses him, and pleases him when he displays her. The applause she occasions makes him happy. He is no real husband, likewise no real father. It is not accidental that he passes no time with his children.

It is obvious from this brief survey that the forgery and its legal disposition have given place to an interest in the individual characters and their relation to each other. What Lindau had maintained impossible in the drama, Passarge finds mathematically logical, the necessary outcome of the deeds and dispositions of the characters. Where Frenzel would have recommended the blue pencil, Passarge admires the exquisite workmanship, the essentiality of each structural detail.

Passarge's volume is anonymously reviewed in *Die Grenzboten*[16] of the same year. The question is raised: Of what importance is Ibsen to Germany?

Much that the author draws from the depths of his soul and philosophical speculations does not impress us with our super-abundant and old literature to the degree it does his countrymen with their recently formed belles lettres. They experience in addition to the force of poetic expression, the charm of its novelty. The peculiar naturalism combined with the ethics of puritanism and radical politics is foreign to us. Ibsen's work is hardly to be understood, at any rate, hardly enjoyed without keeping in mind constantly the peculiar, the individual Norwegian background out of which it sprang. The poet does possess certain qualities which are effective in all places and at all times, which fact justifies Passarge's monograph as an impulse to literati to acquaint themselves with him.

It is no simple matter to give a general characterization of Ibsen. Pessimistic elements are in evidence, at times they predominate. In the struggle to attain to the unconditional inner truth of character, in the mortal hatred he cherishes for all sham, Ibsen occasionally oversteps the very narrow boundary between the absolute truth and hopeless despair. His mastery lies in character portrayal. Although skeptical, he differs substantially from the rational satirists of other times. Beneath his hate is concealed a passionate love, beneath his despair, an ardent desire that order be brought into the modern chaos, that he be the poet to bear the message of deliverance. A free act,— an act, the result of freedom, alone makes men true and free. Love, self-immolation, alone makes men happy.

The writer of this review was the first, as far as I have

16 *Die Grenzboten*, second quarter, 1883, pp. 506–510.

been able to determine, to realize Ibsen's passionate idealism, his yearning for freedom, truthfulness, and happiness, and the belief in the possibility of their attainment.

In a scholarly article, which appeared in *Nord und Süd*, 1883, and which was afterwards included in *Eminent Authors of the Nineteenth Century*,[17] Georg Brandes presents some illuminating material on the same subject. In analyzing Ibsen's pessimism, the critic comes to the conclusion that it is of a moral, not of a metaphysical nature. It has its roots in a conviction of the possibility of the realization of the ideal.

The essay is general. Besides facts of biographical and personal interest, Brandes considers Ibsen as an individualist. It is Brandes' theory that great poets do not create ideas, but are overwhelmed by them. The ideas that impress the poet are those uppermost in the consciousness of the age. The attention of the modern consciousness has been directed to four fields of interest, as Ibsen's plays illustrate: first, the conflict in religion; second, the conflict between the two generations; third, the conflict in society; fourth, the conflict of sex.

As mentioned before, the year 1883 records the first translation of *An Enemy of the People*. Theophil Zolling, Paul Lindau's successor as editor of *Die Gegenwart*,[18] comments upon the play as follows.

An Enemy of the People is a peculiar creation, painful, one-sided, dismal, brightened by no single ray of affection. Only Hebbel among the Germans has this uncouth, wild, and repellent nature. Hebbel always remains the poet. Ibsen is a realist. Everything is dull and commonplace. Wrangling

[17] Brandes: *Moderne Geister, Literarische Bildnisse aus dem XIX Jahrhundert*, 1882. This edition did not contain, as Arnold's statement, page 149, might imply, the essay on Henrik Ibsen.

[18] *Die Gegenwart* 23, 1883; pp. 232–234.

and gossip are dealt with as "*weltbewegende Haupt-und Staatsaktion.*"

What do the miserable creatures and their bathing resort concern us? We want to see human beings love and suffer, — particularly love. But Ibsen ignores any concession, whatsoever, to the public taste. Even love and amiability are nothing but deception to him. "Being a man means to him being a liar." [19]

The composition is broad, undramatic, not even theatrical. "Having become modest, we do not demand of the dramatist the great power of a Hercules, but we do wish to be emotionally interested at least." [20]

In quite another vein, L. Passarge presents his interpretation of the drama.[21]

An Enemy of the People is closely allied in content with *The League of Youth* and *The Pillars of Society.* In the earlier plays it had sufficed the dramatist to disclose the social lie. The characters representing the forces opposing it played but a small part. In *An Enemy of the People,* on the other hand, the opposing force is dramatized in the central figure, Dr. Stockmann, which stands in relief against the conservative, lie-supporting mass.

Poets know no greater grief than the lie which rules the world,— not the naïve untruth of an imaginative individual, nor the untruth of a child, or a trangressor, who seeks for an excuse — but the general, conventional, highly respected lie, that parades about in society, politics, church, and state, the lie which advances with the arrogance of sole right to existence and

19 "*Mensch sein heisst bei ihm geradezu: Lügner sein.*"

20 *Bescheiden geworden verlangen wir von dem Dramatiker zwar nicht mehr die hohe Kraft des Heracles, aber wünschen doch mindestens gemütlich gefesselt zu werden.*"

21 Passarge: *Ein neues Drama von Ibsen; Mag. f. d. Lit. d. Auslandes* 103, p. 98 ff.

which persecutes the truth. To expose this lie in all its forms has been the task of every great poet since Menander and Aristophanes, who does not take refuge in an ideal world, but directs his attention to the present.[22]

This most recent of Ibsen's dramas has the effect of a storm which clears the atmosphere. It does not concern itself with Hecuba, with the sufferings and joys of a single human soul; it leads us to the supreme heights of humanity, as to the summit of a snow-covered mountain in Norway, and unrolls before us, above the mist of the low valleys, the glistening chain of a distant but approachable elevation. With a firm step, as that of an Alpine guide, he leads us up where all doubts and paltry misgivings cease.[23]

Ibsen was fostered by a few friends until 1887, when in the staging of *Ghosts* he made his powerful and comparatively successful third advance. Among his supporters two needs must have mention: Otto Brahm and Paul Schlenther.

Otto Brahm (1855–1912) had received his first training in the theater at Hamburg. In 1881, he came to Berlin to enter a theatrical field of broader scope. Although filled with the ideals of classicism, he possessed a zealous and keen eye for contemporary dramatic efforts. Slowly at first, then irresistibly, he was drawn to Ibsen. Brahm relates:

It happened one day that we (Brahm himself and Schlenther) found ourselves in the tiny Stadt-theater in the Lindenstrasse at the presentation of the *Pillars of Society*. Immediately we experienced the first foreboding of a new poetic world; we felt for the first time placed before people of our day, whom we could accept. And out of a comprehensive social critique of the present, we beheld the ideals of freedom and truth triumphantly

[22] Passarge: *Ein neues Drama von Ibsen; Mag. f. d. Lit. d. Auslandes* 103; p. 98. Appendix, p. 178.
[23] Ibid., p. 101. Appendix, p. 178.

arise as the pillars of society. From that moment on we were disciples of the new realistic art, and our æsthetic interests had found their subject.[24]

Ibsen was the great event in Brahm's life.

For twelve years Brahm remained the leading critic of the Berlin theaters. Thereafter he became the director, until 1904, of the Deutches Theater, later, of the Lessingtheater. Here, through his ability to reveal the hidden treasures of the poet, he led Ibsen to a genuine triumph on the German stage.

Of the early enthusiastic days, ushered in by *The Pillars of Society*, Paul Schlenther (1854–), too, has left an account:

Our youthful eyes were opened to the prevalent tinsel and artificiality of the theaters. We trembled and rejoiced. . . . We visited the theater time and again; and we could sit all day reading the play in Wilhelm Lange's miserable translation. Neither the prosy and stiff German, nor the wooden impersonation of the actors in the suburban theater could vitiate the power of the drama. That was the way, that, ninety years earlier, Schiller's *Love and Intrigue* must have affected the young, though no longer immature, generation. . . . This play (*The Pillars of Society*) taught us to love Ibsen, to admire him for life. I may acknowledge for many of my contemporaries, as well as for myself, that it was the influence of this modern realistic work, at a decisive period in our development, which determined the tendency of our taste for the rest of our lives. We who had grown up under the educative influence of the greatest genius in the field of political realism (Realpolitik) here came upon the most vigorous literary realism (Realliteratur). Out of the affairs of everyday existence, out of business and labor, we saw an art arise, which impressed us more and more profoundly as the imitators of Schiller and romanticism con-

[24] Brahm: *Kritische Schriften*, p. 447 ff. Appendix, pp. 178, 179.

tinued to satisfy us less. It was a joy to live as long as Schiller and Goethe were writing, it was a joy to live as long as romanticism flourished, now again it was a joy to live, for there was living with us a poet who had the strength and the courage to deal with the problems and interests of our day.[25]

Schlenther, in addition to his connection with Brahm, deserves recognition as one of the editors of *Ibsen's Complete Works in the German Language.*

. . . . . .

The years 1880–1886 were distinctly a time of preparation. The vanguards of the new drama divined the impending event, the trend of the decade. The mention of Ibsen's name with that of Goethe is significant. In contrast with the seventies, Ibsen was now taken seriously, vigorously protested by some, supported by a small coterie. At the same time new forces were stirring within Germany itself, independent of Ibsen, and the old were drawing to a fitting close. Both concern us, briefly.

One of the few, who, directly impressed by the war, seemed ready to perceive and appreciate the significance of the historical moment for the literature of the day, was Paul Lindau. Consequently he had established, in 1872, the weekly journal, *The Present* (*Die Gegenwart*), which promised to justify expectations concerning him. But all too soon it was evident that Lindau possessed neither the talent nor the traits of character requisite for such a serious rôle, to say nothing of those traits essential to a leader or a pioneer. His criticisms, at first alert enough, degenerated into random entertainment. Finally he became a dramatist, whose acquaintance we have made.

Though not nearly so disappointing as the drama, the

[25] *Ibsens sämmtliche Werke in deutscher Sprache*, VI, pp. XVII, XVIII. Appendix, p. 179.

lyric and epic had also failed to fulfill the expectations arising from the day's political and national successes. Gustav Freytag's *Our Forefathers*,[26] though inspired by the author's personal participation in the struggle, and depicting historical scenes with considerable power and imagination, fell far short of reproducing the spirit of the day. It seemed that in dreaming of the past, Freytag had forgotten how to portray the present simply and naturally. Friedrich Spielhagen, who never quite succeeded in covering up an inherent romantic bias, fared no better.[27] It remained for the Swiss-German Conrad Ferdinand Meyer (1825–1898), who never enjoyed the popularity or prominence of either Freytag or Spielhagen, adequately to embody the German national cause in his epic of 1871, entitled *The Last Days of Hutten*.[28]

When the new national drama did appear, it, too, failed to embody the spirit of the epoch. Reviving an interest in the national past, instead of the present, it further retarded the development of that realistic art,[29] which was the true expression and contribution of the age. Power,— passion, fire, and magnitude, became the ideal[30] of the moment. Its chief representative, in practice, was Ernst von Wildenbruch.

The Meininger opened the way for Wildenbruch[31] upon the

[26] *Die Ahnen*, 1872–1881.

[27] *Allzeit Voran*, 1872; *Sturmflut*, 1872.

[28] *Huttens letzte Tage*.

[29] Represented by Fritz Reuter, Gottfried Keller, and others.

[30] This is to a great extent the point of view of the two Hart brothers in the *Kritische Waffengänge*, 1882–1884. Truth, vigor, nature, genius, the slogan of the Storm and Stress a century earlier, were the watchwords of their criticism. It opposed the epigonous literature of the day; it turned against the prosiness of the older generation. With the specific school of naturalism that was shortly to arise, it had nothing to do. (Cf. Arnold: *Das moderne Drama*, p. 157.)

[31] *Die Karolinger*, 1882; *Harold*, 1882; *Der Mennonit*, 1882; *Vater und Söhne*, 1882; (all written in the seventies), *Christoph Marlowe*, 1884; *Das neue Gebot*, 1886; *Die Quitzows*, 1888; *Heinrich und Heinrichs Geschlecht*, 1893; *Die Tochter des Erasmus*, 1900; *Die Rabensteinerin*, 1907.

stage by successfully producing *The Carolingians* [31] at Meiningen, March 6, 1881. This drama, which had competed in a prize contest at Munich, in 1878, but had not even been recommended for presentation, was now accepted by a number of theaters. It was staged at Berlin, October 26. The next year *The Menonite,*[31] *Harold,*[31] *Father and Sons,*[31] were put upon the boards, and the dramatist was suddenly famous. But the ultimate significance of Wildenbruch's success was scarcely more than to prove to what extent, in the eyes of the masses, the temperament and character of a writer can take the place of artistic capacity. Although a great number of followers remained true to Wildenbruch until his death, those who were concerned seriously with art had to oppose him, no matter how much they valued his nobility of purpose and of character.

It would scarcely be fair to explain Wildenbruch's popularity entirely on the basis just suggested. As a matter of fact, he was the first, who became generally known, to promise anything better than the preceding decade seemed to have offered. That was enough to gain the support of many who had the future of German literature at heart. They failed for the time being to recognize that what Wildenbruch offered was new only as a product of his individual talent, not as a product of those forces even then rapidly approaching formulation in literary expression. When it was observed that he had not caught the spirit of the age, he was soon, except for the masses referred to, quite ignored.

In the meantime the evidence of new life and strength was accumulating. Simultaneously there arose a deep sense of the necessity of their adequate and congruous expression. How to do that was the question. It was a momentous problem and, therefore, numerous ways and means of solving it were proposed.

Under the leadership of a Dr. Konrad Küster, a society, "Akademische Vereinigung," was organized at Berlin, in 1886, for the purpose of furthering academic reform. A weekly publication bearing the title *Academic Magazine* (*Akademische Zeitschrift*) became the organ of the society. The section devoted to literary interests was soon given into the hands of Leo Berg (1862–1908) who, with Brahm and Schlenther, must be included among the principal advocates of the new movement. A group of literati soon gathered around Berg and the approving Küster, among them Eugen Wolff, John Henry Mackay, Arno Holz, and Johannes Schlaf. Though they hoped to instigate a revolution in literature, the members of the organization did not combine as a clique or school; nor did they accept, not to mention promulgate, any single theory or doctrine of literary production. They were agreed to support, in a general way, the modern trend in literature as opposed to an imitation of the old.

Without concerted action of any kind, the attainment of any purpose was hardly probable. In a paper,[32] read at the second meeting of the society,[33] Eugen Wolff, therefore, attempted to state their position more definitely. Later, to avoid misunderstandings, he prepared a summary of his discussion in the form of tenets,[34] which he hoped would prove acceptible to all members:

I. German literature is at a turning point in its development; it is on the threshhold of a peculiarly significant epoch.

II. All creative literature ought to clarify poetically the spirit of contemporary life; the author of to-day, therefore,

32 *Die Moderne, zur Revolution und Reform der Literatur.*

33 Called *Durch,* literally *through.*

34 I state the theses briefly. Cf. Hanstein: *Das Jüngste Deutschland,* pp. 78, 79.

must consider it his mission poetically to fashion those forces at present actually significant, or struggling to become so, without, however, purposely serving any party or movement of the time.

III. The subject matter of our literature must be modern; it must consider the growing interest in social questions.

IV. It must seek to embody adequately the national character of the German people.

V. It is the task of modern literature to depict men and women of flesh and blood, to portray their passions with inexorable fidelity, without overstepping the innate boundaries of art. Natural truthfulness of the art ought to enhance the æsthetic effect.

VI. Our highest ideal of art is no longer the antique, but the modern.[35]

VII. Such principles are hostile to the imitation of the classics, to blue-stocking dilettantism, and to artificial refinement.

VIII. Such efforts which have as their goal the reform of the prevailing conditions of literature are to be regarded as advantageous and propitious.

IX. The way must be prepared by the development of a sound and mature criticism.

X. Those who have these purposes at heart must rally round and battle for the common cause.

Certain individuals of the group, preferring to develop their personal talents unhampered, would have refused to subscribe to any specifications concerning their work, to say nothing of a series of tenets as Wolff had formulated them. The undertaking of the organization as such was frustrated, therefore, at the very outset.

[35] Wolff was likely the author of the expression *Die Moderne,* which though originally signifying only *the modern* versus *the antique,* later became the slogan of the new movement.

While theorists were discussing and planning the nature and trend of *modern* art, a few authors had furnished specimens of it in lyric and epic form. In 1884, Wilhelm Arent published an anthology entitled *Modern Poets.*[36] Old and new elements were intermingled and confused. A year later Arno Holz issued his *Book of the Day.*[37] These and other attempts remained for the time being rather obscure. Max Kretzer was the first to infuse the new realism into the novel: *The Comrades,*[38] 1881; *The Deceived,*[39] 1882; *The Degenerate,*[40] 1883. Karl Bleibtreu followed the next year with a collection of naturalistic stories entitled *Bad Company.*[41]

The nation continued to remain oblivious to the impending change until Bleibtreu (1859–) made known the fact in a startling pamphlet bearing the title *A Revolution in Literature,*[42] 1886. Ingeniously, if somewhat superficially, Bleibtreu observes that the development of German literature since Goethe and Schiller had led directly to realism. He then illustrates how current literature was for the most part far removed from the thoughts and ideas that actuated the present,—its great social problems, for instance, seemed nonexistent to German authors. Insisting that all the questions of the day be considered, and treated from the modern point of view, Bleibtreu calls attention to those who have measured up, to some degree, at least, to that standard.

Henceforth, the revolution was accepted as an established fact. Its agitators and its practitioners entered the arena of public interest. Although at first separate and distinct, the native currents later merged with those of foreign sources to form the full stream of modern art.

[36] *Moderne Dichtercharaktere.*
[37] *Buch der Zeit.*
[38] *Die beiden Genossen.*
[39] *Die Betrogenen.*
[40] *Die Verkommenen.*
[41] *Schlechte Gesellschaft.*
[42] *Revolution der Literatur.*

CHAPTER V

TRADITIONAL BARRIERS BROKEN, 1887–1891

1887

AT Rome, the twenty-second of December, 1881, Ibsen wrote to Ludwig Passarge:

My new play (meaning *Ghosts*) has now appeared, and has occasioned a terrible uproar in the Scandinavian press; every day I receive letters and newspaper articles decrying or praising it. . . . I consider it utterly impossible that any German theater will accept the play at present. I hardly believe that they will dare to play it in the Scandinavian countries for some time to come.[1]

Ibsen knew well whereof he wrote. The court theaters of the Scandinavian capitals refused admittance to the play. The newspapers were far more liberal in denunciation than in praise, so that, as in the past, Björnson and Brandes stepped in as champions of the author and his work.

Three years passed, for reasons that have been given, before *Ghosts* was put into the hands of the reading public in Germany. In *A Doll's House*, so it seemed then, Ibsen had made at least a slight concession to the agreeable in the character of Helmer. This thoroughly honorable, conscientiously upright man, this good-hearted and attentive husband was a personality, an ideal, which one might behold with pleasure. He was the ray of light in a dismal picture.

[1] *Breve fra H. Ibsen* II, p. 97. Appendix, p. 180.

In *Ghosts* Ibsen extinguished even a hint of light. Not a breath of air relieved the suffocating depression, not the palest ray pierced the dismal gloom.

Thus the impression was established that the author of *Ghosts* and *A Doll's House* was possessed of a morbid predilection for abhorrent subjects. The repetition of the treatment of heredity was construed as a monomania on this point. So shocking was the subject matter that few were able to recognize anything beyond its horror.

In November of 1886, Otto Brahm concluded a brief essay on Ibsen with the following words:

> Up to the present no one has taken upon himself the admirable duty, by means of a coherent plan, to introduce an entire public into the poet's train of thought, and by means of the presentation of his modern plays from *The League of Youth* on, to mature German theater-goers for Ibsen. But sooner or later, the time must come, in which recognition of such a duty will arise among us. For here a poet has come forth, who, renouncing all imitation, has set sail for unknown shores, which are being approached by the waving pennants of a nascent art.[2]

As a matter of fact, at the very time of Brahm's writing, his hope and prophecy were approaching at least a partial realization. At the instigation of certain young authors of Munich, *Ghosts* had been put upon the boards privately, April 14, at Augsburg. In December followed a presentation at Meiningen by the Meininger court troupe. An attempt on the part of this troupe to reproduce the drama at Berlin met defeat at the hands of the censor. But this obstruction, too, was temporarily set aside. Franz Wallner, the dramaturgist at the Residenztheater, obtained permission to present *Ghosts* a single time, for charitable purposes at a mati-

2 Brahm: *Henrik Ibsen; Deutsche Rundschau* 49, p. 219 ff. Appendix, p. 180.

née,[3] January 9, 1887.[4]

Wallner, himself, who acted the part of Oswald, has left an account of the presentation:

> I have never again experienced anything like it. After the curtain had fallen for the first time, silence reigned for several seconds; everybody was held spellbound by the powerful drama. But then a storm, a hurricane, broke forth, as I had never witnessed it in a theater. The dramatist was acclaimed by all, — there was no disapproval — and willingly, drunk with victory, he appeared repeatedly upon the stage,— tears of joy running down his cheeks.[5]

Although a decisive event in the history of Ibsen's influence in Germany and in the history of the German drama, the performance was not a victory for the drama itself. It had been widely read, it had been the most popular of all new publications at Christmas time (1886), but the public could not reconcile itself to the overpowering and "distressing" theme.

Brahm may serve as spokesman for the Ibsenian coterie:

[3] This performance has generally passed as the première at Berlin. Leo Berg (*Henrik Ibsen*, p. 36) calls attention to the actual first performance by the Berlin Dramatic Society at the Architektenhause, Jan. 2.

[4] *Ghosts* was first played by a traveling company in Chicago and other cities of the Middle West, in the summer of 1882. Then by August Lindberg's traveling company at Helsingborg, Aug. 22, 1883; at Copenhagen, Aug. 28, 1883; at Stockholm, Sept. 12, 1883. Then at Stockholm, Sept. 27, 1883, in the court theater. No established theater in Norway presented the drama until the theater at Bergen opened its doors, Dec. 3, 1890. No theater of such standing in Kristiania witnessed *Ghosts* before March 20, 1898. The first established theater to play the drama in Berlin was the Deutsches Theater, in 1894. It was produced by the Théâtre libre, Paris, May 29 and 30, 1890. In London a private performance by the Independent Theater, March 13, 1891. In Milan, Feb. 22, 1892, by Zacconi who also played in Rome, Turin, Venice, Vienna, Munich, and other large cities. Played in Spain, 1894; in South America, 1897, by Novelli. Played often after 1895.

[5] Lothar: *Henrik Ibsen*, p. 112. Appendix, p. 180.

If the aim in the development of all literature (*Dichtung*) is to absorb more and more of nature into art, to wrest new poetic fields from life,— as Faust obtained land from the sea — then, no recent dramatist has gone forward more boldly and more magnificently than the author of *Ghosts*. . . . But, what is the new, the decisive aspect, of this drama? It is the unconditional truth, the relentless, garish truth, if you choose so to call it, in the portrayal of human character. The dramatist shows us human beings, actual, living men and women, fully and completely observed,— and just because he dares to separate himself entirely from these figures, those who do not know what artistic objectivity really implies, are inclined time and again to identify the dramatist with his characters.[6]

Considering the dramatic literature of the day, *Ghosts* was an extreme innovation. It is natural, therefore, that the critical comment should hardly be moderate. As much as it might be regretted, on the one hand, that the discussions carried on by the daily papers cannot be followed, the available reviews, on the other hand, do not fall short of affording an adequate notion of the controversy.

If credence is to be granted Leo Berg,[7] the Berlin critics gave a striking illustration of their inability to cope with a problem of aesthetics. Not that they rejected the play on account of its originality, nor that they failed to appreciate its contents, but that they were at sea, objecting to the play, as a school boy does to Ovid, because it is too difficult. Their inability was further apparent in confusing the drama with the *pièce des moeurs* à la Augier, Dumas, Sardou.

The reiterated objection that *Ghosts* is too depressing, that it fails to liberate the human spirit, Berg refutes.

[6] Brahm: *Kritische Schriften*, p. 107 ff. Appendix, pp. 180, 181.
[7] Berg: *Gesellschaft*, 1887, 1; p. 230 ff.

Lear, *Macbeth*, and *Othello* are equally crushing. The force of Ibsen's play sunders all that is mean, narrow-minded, vain, petty, egotistic, from the soul. Thus freed, light may enter with the rising sun.

The critics often fail to discover the plot of the drama. It lies in the expulsion of the ghosts, all the dead opinions and beliefs inherited from father and mother,— a procedure that takes place within the heroine. The force opposing her is society, represented by Pastor Manders. He who feels himself too deeply moved by the fate of Oswald proves thereby that he failed to grasp the intent of the play. (Berg.)

That Ibsen had, however, in spite of all derogatory criticism,— perhaps because of it — actually won the contest between the old and the new became ever more apparent. There arose a competition to stage Ibsen. The same year, 1887, bore witness to the presentation of *An Enemy of the People*, which had been ignored for three years. *Rosmersholm* was given two performances, first at Augsburg, then at Berlin.

On account of our inveterate enthusiasm for everything foreign, writes Frenzel,[8] an Ibsenian school has quickly arisen among us. Blindly they follow their master in all the labyrinthine ramifications of his pessimism. In their unreserved admiration, which extols Ibsen as the greatest modern dramatist, beside whom Augier, Sardou, Alexander Dumas appear as schoolboys, they overlook the fact that Ibsen is a Norwegian poet incapable of forsaking his native point of view. All his dramas bear the impress of a Norwegian *Aufklärungstendenz*. The psychological element, in which his talent is rooted, lends to his characters,— because he is far more the thinker than the poet, that characteristic

[8] Frenzel: *Deutsche Rundschau* 51, p. 464 ff.

which makes them so incomprehensible to the naïve observer.

It is never a truly tragic guilt, a powerful destiny, that crushes the hero; his environment and the air he breathes prepare his downfall. The pessimistic elements in the poet have their origin only to a small degree in the perception of universal misery; it is the misery of Norway that aggravates and pains him. The name of his illness is not Existence, but Norway. If the Ibsenian heroes ever had the opportunity to take a walk Unter den Linden or upon the Boulevard in Paris, they would be cured of their whims.

If the plots are examined closely, by means of which the poet tries to clothe his physiological and psychological views and conceptions, one meets with a characteristic uncertainty, obscurity, and timidity to draw the final conclusions and to designate things by their actual names.

The main question in his plays is not as in the real drama, — what is going to happen to the characters, but what was their past existence. This is properly the subject matter for a novel,— and such a psychological narrative with its moral and spiritual subtlety is the antipode of the genuine drama.

Of the three plays, *Rosmersholm, An Enemy of the People,* and *Ghosts,* the last mentioned is the strongest and morally the most reprehensible. On that account, the constabulary censor allowed but one performance. Ibsen is a poison, but society has become immune to its effects. It is beyond the power of the stage to do any harm to the modern man.

If the highest purpose of dramatic art is to provoke a kind of "moral sea-sickness," then Henrik Ibsen, with his incomparable talent, is the master of that art. He succeeds best in exposing the painful in human life and in torturing his audience.

Another critic contests Ibsen's illustration of the awful

truth concerning the sins of the father.[9] The ingenious author has unfortunately left the field of trustworthy experience and has constructed circumstances for which life presents no counterpart. Such a malady as Oswald's never can be attributed to heredity. From whatever aspect the drama is approached, its natural impossibility is clear. It belongs far more to the realm of fancy than to the world of actuality, a circumstance which necessarily weakens the thesis of the play.

Georg Malkowsky is the author of a more positive estimate. The most exacting critique fails to find a discrepancy in the motivation or logic of events. All the characters act as they must act, being what they are, and placed in the given circumstances. They are men and women of flesh and blood. Though they are not refreshing and comforting, they are true to the last detail.

The idea of the play has been misinterpreted by the critics. The ghosts are antiquated points of view and rules of conduct opposed to nature and its moral law. The fear of these conventional views drives the people into unnatural and perverted conditions. And the harvest is not unlike the seed.

The play is filled with a moral earnestness, which fact waylays any attempted moral indignation.[10]

An Ibsen cult arose, not among those who for balanced and æsthetic reasons became his disciples, but a cult of those who for the time being were active in disseminating their opinions of what the master meant. A situation so opportune for satire was not to be ignored.[11] It was at this time

[9] Emil Jonas: *Ueber die Dichtungen der Gegenwart und ihre Vorliebe für Krankheitsschilderungen; Mag. f. d. Lit. d. In. u. Auslandes* 109, 1886, 1; p. 293.

[10] Malkowsky: *Gegenwart* 31, p. 45 ff.

[11] Karl Borinski: *Gespenster, ein Gespräch; Grenzboten,* 1887, 1; p. 321 ff.

that a youthful student graduating from the University of Berlin proposed, according to the prevailing custom, to support, among others, the thesis that "The Malady of Oscar Alving in Ibsen's *Ghosts* Approximates a Case of Progressive Paralysis." The student must have erred in his diagnosis, which an observant *medikus* [12] could not allow to pass uncorrected, although, he concludes, a professional analysis of Oswald Alving's case hardly bears upon the drama as a work of art. This example of rather ridiculous extravagance, such we should term it to-day, serves as further evidence of the extent, if not of the depth, to which Ibsen had at first affected the young generation in Germany.

The interest aroused by the production of *Ghosts* led to two presentations of *An Enemy of the People* [13] at the Ostend-Theater of Berlin. The first performance, on March 5th, was witnessed by a literary audience, the second by a more naïve and untrained public. In both instances storms of approval greeted the players.

The super-intelligent observers, Brahm informs us,[14] could only oppose the increasing interest of the general public in Ibsen by recourse to nationalism versus the predominating *Ausländerei.* It had been these very individuals, however, who had calmly endured the absorption of the German boards by the French, much further removed from German taste and spirit. There resounds in Ibsen's dramas, Brahm maintains his point, a fundamental tone of genuine Germanic quality. The defiant positiveness, which in the struggle for recognized right despises the opposition of the multitude, and the clear confidence in self and in good cause, which Stockmann embodies, are characteristic too of

12 Medikus: *Ibsen und die Medicin; Gegenwart* 35, 1889, 1; p. 200 ff.

13 *An Enemy of the People,* played in Paris, Nov. 9, 1893; London, the same year.

Kleist's *Michael Kohlhaas*, Otto Ludwig's *Erbförster*, and, somewhat altered, also of Goethe's *Götz* and Schiller's *Karl Moor*.[14]

In *An Enemy of the People*, Ibsen had followed the hero to a turning point, not to the end of his career. This seemed annoying. *Ghosts* had been labeled "distressing"; *An Enemy of the People* was "unsatisfying." The themes of the new plays were too unusual, too striking. Until the excitement occasioned by them was allayed, the contemplation of their artistic merit was, as a matter of course, out of the question. Stein records,[15] therefore, that Oskar Blumenthal, initially an opponent, then a champion, of the dramatist, was the first to stage *An Enemy of the People* with some insight,— at the Lessing-theater, 1890. A fully satisfactory presentation of the tragi-comedy was postponed until undertaken by the Deutches Theater, May 12, 1901. The next drama to come before the public eye was *Rosmersholm.*

Rosmersholm. Ibsen's dramas are a continued struggle against the lie, and a victory of the spirit of truth. Wherein is their dramatic strength to be found? In the plot? There are hundreds of plays with more significant plots. In the dialogue? More elegant, flowing, and perspicuous dialogue is to be found. In their effectfulness? The common effects are avoided with almost Puritan rigor. The victorious strength of the plays lies alone in the idea, in the resolute prosecution of the idea, which is never turned aside by bogus effects and ornament, by empty phrases, by superfluous romance. The one idea, which constructs the play, is so great, so true and staggering, that it carries us away,— crushes us,— and liberates us. As no other modern dramatist, Ibsen is master of the secret of dramatic force. . . .

[14] Brahm: *Kritische Schriften*, p. 121 ff.
[15] Stein: *Henrik Ibsen*, p. 20.

Much in the characters (of *Rosmersholm*), their customs and conversation, seems strange to us. It is a different, more heroic, more rugged, yet dreamier race of men, that speaks and acts there. Yet, nevertheless, we feel that just in such a manner these old Germanic viking characters must speak and act.

I am of the opinion that we Germans are not to-day able adequately to present these characters on the stage, which is to be regretted. A brighter future must not only rear among us the proper public for Ibsen, but also the efficient actors. The eternal *Französelei* has incapacitated both to dip at the pure spring of genuine German art. On that account, Ibsen is a stumbling block to so many.[16]

Another commentator[17] perceives the dramatist in *Rosmersholm* revealed in his greatness and in his entirety. Here Ibsen expounds the vigor of life in union with happy innocence as the force which will accomplish everything great and good. Happy innocence is, however, not the possession of the struggling individual of a transitional epoch, upon whose shoulders his own and others' guilt rests, about whom the sins of his generation swoop as the white horses about Rosmersholm. One thing alone is given to the man of to-day, the renunciation of love. This melancholy refrain, begun in *The Wild Duck*, swells into a powerful chord in *Rosmersholm.* The courage of life and the renunciation of love!

Ibsen is always symbolic, even where he appears to be true to actuality. His characters are half-observed, half-constructed,— observed with the eye of a genius, defectively constructed. When they analyze themselves, they are incomparable; when Ibsen construes them, they disintegrate. *Rosmersholm*, perhaps, suffers most from these faults.

[16] L. Willfried: *Gesellschaft*, 1887, 2; p. 748 ff. Appendix, pp. 181, 182.
[17] L. Marholm: *Henrik Ibsens neueste Dramen; Gegenwart* 31, p. 7 ff.

To Otto Brahm the characters of *Rosmersholm* seem related to those of the Shaksperean drama. Rebekka West is not only similar to Shaksperean characters in her primitive nature, in her power to sin, but also in her power to repent. The ethical forces do not triumph more signally within Macbeth than they do within Rebekka. Rosmer and Rebekka, the *vita contemplativa* and the *vita activa*, are contrasted. Unscrupulous will, on the one side, ethical consideration and reflection, on the other. In the struggle between the two, refined morality conquers. The past burdens both with guilt, which they expiate together.[18]

The initial production[19] of *Rosmersholm* at Augsburg was a decided success. Ibsen, who was present in person, was greeted with prolonged applause.[20] The attempts to stage the play at Berlin seemed not to have fared so well.

On the fifth of November there appeared in the *Gegenwart*[21] a brief disquisition by Oskar Bulle on Henrik Ibsen's *Demand of the Ideal*, which, on account of its intimate connection with *Rosmersholm*, may most properly be considered here. The substantial foundation of Ibsen's life and work, he writes, is "the demand of the ideal." Thus in *The Wild Duck* Ibsen makes answer to the jeering query,— if he had not in the course of years grown sufficiently in wisdom to reduce somewhat the sum total of the ethical demand, with the decisive rejoinder: Never, if I stand before real, genuine human beings. This inexorable severity of the demand admits of no amelioration. Manners, customs, religion, society weigh not a jot against it.

Ibsen is keenly aware of the overwhelming millions of dis-

[18] Brahm: *Kritische Schriften*, p. 131 ff.

[19] *Rosmersholm*, first played in London, Feb. 23, 1891; in Paris, Oct. 4, 1893.

[20] Paul Lindau: *Allerlei über Theater; Nord und Süd* 42, p. 267 ff.

[21] *Gegenwart* 32, p. 295 ff. Also *Kunstwart* I, p. 51 ff.

tortions in the world, the few genuine men and women. In *Rosmersholm*, therefore, he sets himself the task of ennobling all men (*alle Menschen im Lande zu Adelsmenschen zu machen*). "I will try," says Rosmer, "to spur them on. They themselves must accomplish it" (Act I). Man cannot be ennobled from without.

Ibsen would set human kind to thinking, to considering, without going into the details of what the new order will call for. Until that age, and perhaps forever, remains the demand. The demand of the ideal of truth. Truth is the one worthy goal of man. Truth gives to mankind its nobility and freedom, its joy and innocence. To allow truth to shine unobstructed, Ibsen demolishes truths. Truths may grow old, and be no longer true. Only when the truth is decrepit does the great mass accept it. Therefore, no formula; the demand of the ideal is individual. Each individual must fashion and improve his own.

Ibsen demands the adjustment and direction of the will to the true, the sensible, the good. He demands a purification of thought, refinement of conscience, and a harmonious agreement of insight, conscience, and action.

In *Rosmersholm*, the most profound and noblest of his dramas, Bulle continues, the demand of the ideal finds its most powerful, deepest, and saddest expression. The question arises: When will the demand realize its fulfillment? Will not the ignorant and brutal present, or the unavoidable force of the past ruthlessly sunder the two genuine, ennobled beings who are about to fulfill it? Ibsen's service lies in his raising the question.

Culture will progress, but the lie will remain. For thousands of years to come, therefore, as to-day, the demand of the ideal will be valid. And then, as to-day, Ibsen's dramas will proclaim it.

The apprehension of *Rosmersholm* apparently did not develop so rapidly or steadily as that of the other dramas Ibsen sent out in the eighties. Both public and critics suffered relapses. The Lessingtheater produced the play in 1890. Although the *Berliner Tageblatt* maintained that the performance had the air of a *Weihspiel*, the *Kreuzzeitung* recorded that the dull spirit of ennui crept into the theater. The public, nevertheless, responded with considerable sympathy. The presentation of the drama in the Deutsches Theater, September, 1899, was, according to Stein,[22] not only at last satisfactory, but a remarkable triumph of modern dramatic art. Emanuel Reicher played the rôle of Rosmer, Louise Dumont, the rôle of Rebekka, with the admirable support of Nissen, Oskar Sauer, and Max Reinhardt in the rôles of Kroll, Brendel, and Mortensgard, respectively. The close and earnest attention of the audience was index enough of the progress made since the earlier attempts.

Before leaving the momentous occurrences of 1887, a little space must be granted the opinions of the more reserved adherents of the conservative party.

The corrupting mistake in the modern desire for truth in art and literature is the erroneous idea that all human suffering which arouses compassion is worthy of being the object of artistic treatment. Such a notion usually confuses the concept of the sorrowful with that of the tragic. Because of the failure to recognize this distinction, artists have made countless mistakes in the choice of subject matter.

The ideal of the beautiful in art once lost, *Camélias*, and Hebbel's "dramas of terror and torment" are natural sequels. Yet Hebbel never ventured to cast the concept of the tragic overboard. None has gone so far as Henrik

[22] Stein: *Henrik Ibsen*, p. 25 ff.

Ibsen. His *Ghosts* is a declaration of war against modern æsthetics. The much vaunted truth in the modern drama, upon analysis, is not true. The modern art is not *art*.[23]

Another critic is confident of the transient nature of the evil:

Indeed, it is true that realism has prevailed for the time being, but it is a canker of the time, as the sentimental bias which called forth *Werther* a hundred years ago. At present a physician for the malady is not at hand, but I do not doubt for a moment that he will come. Of course, every disease leaves its traces, but its purging effect is often salutary. We hope that this result will not be wanting in the present case. Pessimism, realism, naturalism, etc., are ulcers, excrescences, which, perhaps, prognosticate an imminent revolution. Their evil humors — as has been the case formerly under similar circumstances — must be expelled from the whole provided it is sound and has retained its vitality. There is, moreover, such a dissimilarity among realists, that one hardly knows at times, what to make of it. I should almost like to say that idealistic realists are also to be found.

Such dramas as those of Henrik Ibsen, for example, demonstrate by their present vogue how little vitality they contain. It has never been the concern of art to offer the repulsive; symmetry and calm, exalted beauty are the criteria. It is time that we recall to memory the words of our immortal poet:

Ernst ist das Leben, heiter ist die Kunst.[24]

We turn to the next eventful year.

1888

Ibsen had now reached his sixtieth year. In an interesting account, *My Intercourse with Henrik Ibsen*, Fritz

[23] Eugen Sierke: *Henrik Ibsen und der Realismus auf der Bühne; Unsere Zeit*, 1887, *2*; p. 185 ff.

[24] H. von Pilgrim: *Die Bühne und ihre Zukunft; Mag. f. d. Lit. d. Auslandes* 111, 1887; pp. 329, 340. Appendix, p. 182.

Hammer has preserved a peculiarly human portrait of the aging dramatist, to whom Munich had become a second home:

It occurred in the Café Maximilian. As long as Ibsen has been living in Munich he is to be seen there every evening, no matter the weather, between 6:30 and 7:30 — at no other hour — always seated at the second or third table to the right of the entrance. He is usually alone, a glass of beer or a glass of cognac and a water bottle in front of him, a newspaper in his hand,— over the top of which he is usually reading with a comprehensive and serene attention. The people who throng in and out are themselves a chronicle, a living collection of journals, as important and interesting, at least, as the printed pages of the daily papers. Often Ibsen sits there as a "guest of stone," motionless, introspective, his lips tightly closed, his left hand upon his thigh, his right hand resting lightly upon the marble table, the fingers as though holding a pen — as if in contemplation at his desk, in absorbing mental work. Then he quietly gets up, takes his cane, silk hat, and gloves which always lie upon a chair near by, and leaves with short, silent steps.

It was in the Café Maximilian. After I had seen Henrik Ibsen there for the third time, I gathered enough courage to disturb his solitude. I introduced myself to him. He shook hands with me and remained standing. After the formalities had been disposed of, he invited me to sit down with him. He spoke with a subdued, mild intonation. His usually passive features became uncommonly pleasing and animated. Since then I have never heard him talk in any other way.[25]

The *Wild Duck* was the next drama to solicit consideration. The first to call attention to it, about a year after

[25] Hammer: *Mein Verkehr mit Henrik Ibsen: Gesellschaft,* 1888, 2; pp. 741–42. Appendix, p. 183. Compare with this the account Lothar (p. 121 ff.) quotes from M. G. Conrad's *Tagebuch.* Sentence upon sentence, identical!

its publication, was Rudolf Schmidt, in *Scandinavian Letters*.[26] This play, he writes, is weak in its endeavor to inculcate a general truth by means of insignificant characters. In its theatrical aspects the play is the work of a master most probably at present unexcelled.

The initial presentation,[27] at Berlin, March 4, was awaited with intense expectation. Brahm states [28] that the play had been widely read and admired. The masterly characterization of the persons of the play had enlisted the liveliest interest and approval. The form, on the contrary, had raised doubts and queries in the minds of many. With the presentation, however, all uncertainties as to the new masterpiece were dispersed. The eminent dramatic and theatrical surety of the master's hand was unquestionable when viewed before the boards.

Again Brahm discovers the dramatist of Shaksperean ability. Ibsen possesses that Shaksperean versatility which allows him to objectify his characters. He shows not only what the people are, but also why they are so.[29]

The spiritual poles of the drama are the contrasted pessimist and optimist. The increasing clarity of the antithesis during the progress of the play, until, finally, the entire train of thought stands revealed did not fail in its effect upon the audience.

But, as is always the case in Ibsen's plays, the spiritual problem is most closely connected with the fable. Thus, seemingly in a natural way,— which is the triumph of the greatest art — the one develops out of and with the other.[30]

[26] *Mag. f. d. Lit.* 109, 1886, 1; p. 36.

[27] *The Wild Duck,* played by the Théâtre libre, Paris, April 27, 1891; London, May 4, 1894.

[28] Brahm: *Kritische Schriften,* p. 158 ff.

[29] Brahm: *Krit. Schriften,* p. 161.

[30] Ibid, p. 162. "*Aber wie stets bei Ibsen verschlingt sich mit dem*

The spiritual import of the play was not generally recognized at the first presentation. Its artistic achievement, on the other hand, was irresistible. The feeling that a dramatist of the first rank had arisen, became a conviction. Although, as Brahm writes, Ibsen had not yet been represented upon the German stage in quantity, the impress that he had made was extraordinary. He had virtually reanimated the life of the theater.[31]

Even Karl Frenzel concluded that, in spite of other faults, the delineation of the Ekdal home is remarkable and extremely effective.

The stage in Denmark and Norway has become a rostrum from which the emancipation of woman, the social status of matrimony, the education of children, the immorality of the upper circles, the sad fate of the girl of the common classes, the struggle against brandy are discussed. The dramatic form is not chosen for its art, but for its great effect upon the multitudes. Purposely the dramatic talent places itself in the service of social welfare. In realism, which demands truth and not beauty, the aims and powers which *per se* have nothing to do with art become the all important ones. Ibsen treads in these tracks ever since he wrote *The Pillars of Society*, except that his theses remain ever more obscure under the veil which rests upon his last works, and the remnant of idealism which still maintains constantly smuggles a phantastic element into the realistic fable and characterization. The observer perceives without difficulty that the design of the dramatist in the *Wild Duck* is to present the wretchedness and baseness of the average man when confronted by the "demand of the ideal," and forcibly to express his view of life in its utter hopelessness. But this impression is continually confused by the observation that Gregers

geistigen Problem auf das innigste die Fabel des Stückes; mit einer scheinbaren Natürlichkeit, die zugleich der Triumph der gröesten Kunst ist, entwickelt sich das eine aus dem anderen und mit dem anderen."

[31] Ibid., p. 163.

Werle, who exacts the demand of the ideal, is a fool whose clumsy procedure to raise up a friend from moral deterioration involves the death of the lovable child. Gregers Werle, like Johannes Rosmer, is obsessed by a single idea,— to ennoble the work-a-day man, to make a superman of him, only to find, after the failure of his attempt, that he has no other destiny than that of being the thirteenth at table. . . .

The obscurity, the want of frankness to designate things by their real names, is characteristic of Ibsen's method of representation. We the observers, are expected to guess what he, the dramatist, does not dare to state clearly. . . .

The portrayal of the four persons, of their, in part, needy, and, in part, phantastic surroundings, the cretinism of the old man, Gina's resoluteness, Hjalmar's vague, mendacious, stagy disposition, the poetic fragrance which envelops Hedwig — is in its veracity and peculiar local coloring decidedly touching and admirable. Even the symbolism of the wild duck is not too disturbing; one becomes accustomed to the adventurous creation of the dramatist, however little it has to do with the plot.[32]

In *The Wild Duck*, another critic proceeds,[33] the realist Ibsen comes to the same conclusion as the idealist Schiller:

Life is but error
Nur der Irrtum ist das Leben
Knowing is death.
Und das Wissen ist der Tod.

But this applies only to men like Hjalmar Ekdal, not to a Stockmann, a Brand, or a Nora. Since the great mass consists of Hjalmars, Ibsen's social pessimism is not awry.

The *Wild Duck*, as *Rosmersholm*, is the final catastrophe of a drama. The exposition and the peripeteia are necessarily, therefore, outside the play itself,— in the past, and

[32] Frenzel: *Deutsche Rundschau 55*, p. 461 ff. Appendix, pp. 183–185.
[33] Julius Brand: *Gesellschaft*, 1888, *2*; p. 1136 ff.

must be related. This error is compensated for by the splendid dialogue of which Ibsen is a master as no other living writer.

The characterization of little Hedwig is a masterpiece. Every word has been reproduced from life. And still there are oracles upon critical tripods who maintain that Ibsen is not a realist. If they are asked why, they reply: Because he depicts unusual conditions. As though realism dared portray only commonplace people and work-a-day happenings! Realism is not dependent upon subject matter, it is determined by method. In contradistinction to the idealist, who is the colorist, or conventionalist, who writes from reminiscence, the realist writes from direct experience.

That is the reason every new drama of Ibsen affects us as a discovery in the domain of dramatic art, a widening of its boundaries. The study of this dramatist is recommended to all those who thoughtlessly repeat the commonplace of the incapacity of our time to produce drama. Above all, this study is recommended to young Germany.

Ibsen's dramas are the best poetics for beginning dramatists (far be it that imitation be encouraged); they are also the best ethics for future men.[34]

Quite different is the opinion of Ulrich Klein[35] to whom *The Wild Duck* is morally reprehensible:

There exists a truth of perception and a truth of will. The first concerns that which is; the second, that which ought to be. The latter is the moral truth, the good, which man is supposed to realize in his actions.

Although man sins, he does not want sin to endure. Something lives within him which revolts against evil. This revolt is not necessarily the result of voluntary and logical

[34] Brand: *Gesellschaft,* 1888, 2; pp. 1137–38. Appendix, p. 185.
[35] Klein: *Kunstwart* I, p. 242 ff.

thought; it is instinct. When man offends against it, it corrects him. This powerful something is *shame.*

It is the feeling of shame, therefore, which prohibits man from acknowledging his unchaste actions to every one. Silence concerning a sin is by no means in itself the disposition to lie.

Man sins, but he does not want sin to endure. This principle of man, Ibsen misinterprets. The result is this. The world conceals its sin out of a feeling of shame. A dramatist appears and, on that account, repudiates the world as nefariously mendacious. He insists upon the truth. What does he then demand? Nothing more nor less than shamelessness! That truth is pernicious to the common weal.

The Wild Duck was the seal upon the traditional æsthetics. With especial directness it pointed to the irretrievable displacement of what the old school, hence, its discomfiture, had been defending with so much zeal. The deeper significance of the tragedy was in a great measure disclosed by Oskar Sauer, who perceived in Gregers Werle much of Hamlet, at the Deutsches Theater, January 7, 1897.[36]

The revival of *A Doll's House* at the Lessingtheater, in November, was rewarded with success. By March, 1890, sixty performances had been given in this theater alone. In the meantime, the Residenztheater had played *Nora* at least ninety times. A performance of *Lady Inger* seems to have passed unnoticed.

This same year, 1888, brought forth what is in a number of ways the most suggestive criticism of Ibsen and his work appearing in the thirty years under consideration — entitled *Henrik Ibsen's Intellectual Development and Art,*[37] by

[36] Stein: *Henrik Ibsen,* p. 28.

[37] E. Kühnemann: *Henrik Ibsens Geistesentwickelung und Kunst; Gesellschaft,* 1888, *2*; pp. 725 ff., 881 ff.

Eugen Kühnemann. A few remarks chosen from the concluding pages follow.

Ibsen's art is based upon his faculty of close perception and his intellectual power, which penetrate into the secrets of human existence. On that account, there are no ideal characters in his dramas. The idealistic trait in his works lies in their powerful disposition, in the victory of the new and liberated points of view.

Since Ibsen seeks to delineate the separation of the new age from the old, he must, as a matter of course, show the conflict of their forces. He is convinced that outwardly, at least, the passing age maintains its prestige. Necessarily, therefore, the situations depicted are more or less dismal. By no means, however, is Ibsen a pessimist. The tragedy in his plays is in its inner nature conciliatory.

In his greatest works, *Ghosts*, *Rosmersholm*, *The Wild Duck*, he has rejuvenated the Greek tragedy. The past penetrates step by step more deeply into the soul of man and he succumbs — as Œdipus the King, whom Schiller had so much admired and had not been able to approach.

Outwardly calm, inwardly active, the Greek and the Ibsenian drama are identical. This structure alone could lend complete expression to Ibsen's fundamental ideas. Content and form are in concord.

Shakspere had been the dramatist of the individual. Ibsen is the dramatist of his individuality. In depth and art the latter is an important step forward.

1889

When published, *The Lady from the Sea* was heralded and advertised as the creation of a new Ibsen, a work, simple, intelligible, and optimistic. Four theaters applied for the privilege of producing it first, only, after careful perusal,

to decline it. The play attained a presentation finally, March 5th,[38] on the boards of the Schauspielhaus, Berlin.

The reception of the drama was far less enthusiastic than that of either *The Wild Duck* or the recent productions of *Nora*, which the audiences had approved almost completely. The critics, in general, gave voice to a number of objections. The realistic treatment was considered unfortunate for the romantic subject matter chosen,— Ellida was interpreted as a water sprite. The solution of the problem, though poetic, and theatrically effective, because surprising, was disapproved as illogical and non-naturalistic. "He who knows women, he who understands Ellida, her inherited madness and hysteria,— for at bottom that is her trouble — could safely wager that she would actually and truly act differently, and not withstand the uncanny lure."[39]

The drama is full of contradictions. On the one hand, the dramatist preaches the unlimited exercise and unfolding of the individuality, with utter disregard to social sanction and decency; on the other, he insists upon the most severe ethical demands which subject the individual to the eternal principles of the moral law, "although no normal truth lives longer than twenty years." The first principle would lead not only to complete barbarism, but it would denote the destruction of the second.[40]

Of all of Ibsen's plays, writes Frenzel, *The Lady from the Sea* has the weakest plot and the least dramatic substance. And since he is no medium and no juggler, Frenzel continues

[38] Played in London, May 11, 1891; in Paris, Dec. 17, 1892.

[39] Zolling; *Gegenwart* 35, p. 174. *Wer die Frauen kennt, wer eine Ellida versteht, ihren hereditären Wahnsinn und ihre Hysterie, denn im Grunde ist dies ihr Leiden, möchte darauf wetten, dass sie in Wirklichkeit und Wahrheit anders handeln und der grauenhaften Lockung nicht widerstehen würde.*

[40] Gustav Schollwöck: *Grenzboten* 49, 2; p. 130.

his remonstrances, he cannot follow the dramatist into the fourth dimension into which the intricacy of his hypothesis leads him.[41]

The Lady from the Sea was, therefore, for a good share of the Berlin public an undramatic, tedious, inconsistent, and even mad dramatic effort. The applause actually occasioned was attributed to the Ibsenian cult (Ibsen-Gemeinde), the like of which, according to Brahm,[42] had no authentic existence.

Brahm attributes the comparatively cool reception of the drama to the decided Northern coloring, which remained foreign to many of the readers and many of the audience. The players, moreover, were scarcely equal to their task.[43]

This last, frequently quoted reproof demands a moment's attention and a word of explanation, if for no other reason than to obviate the possible impression that Ibsen was being played by mediocre talent in second-rate playhouses. The truth of the matter is that Ibsen demanded a special kind of training, a new technique, which impersonators needed to grow into. This accomplished for any single drama, remarkable impersonations were not uncommon. Excluding Frau Niemann-Raabe, of whose interpretation, though lauded and admired, little is actually known, four actresses of ability and repute played Nora, for example, in Berlin alone: Eleonora Duse, Agnes Sorma, Gabrielle Réjane, and, later, Irene Triesch.[44]

In South Germany (Munich), three months later, a happier acceptance of *The Lady from the Sea* was predicted. Ibsen surprises us anew with each one of his works. His recent drama, which occupies, perhaps, the zenith of his dra-

41 Karl Frenzel: *Deutsche Rundschau* 59; p. 301.
42 Brahm: *Kritische Schriften,* p. 235.
43 Ibid., p. 236 ff.
44 Cf. Stein: *Henrik Ibsen,* p. 9 ff.

matic writings, is the point of departure into new fields of creative art,— no longer the annihilating negation, but the joyful affirmation of life. It is the most complete and most agreeable of his works. It is destined to silence all opposition by the positive proof that Ibsen is not a pessimist. No pessimist is able, after his earlier severe and rigorous work, to present to us a drama of conciliation so poetic, so replete with the joy of living.[45]

Yet Stein [46] is of the opinion that neither *The Lady from the Sea* nor, afterwards, *The Masterbuilder* ever received full justice on the boards of Germany (prior to 1901), to say nothing of the first performance. Viewing the drama from the standpoint of *bon sens*, the public failed to penetrate into the underlying significance of the play. Ten years later, it was presented twelve times at the Schillertheater with some improvement.

During the year, *The Pillars of Society* reappeared upon the stage to remain there. By 1899 the play had been presented over twelve hundred times, in no less than sixty theaters.[47] The success of the seventies was repeated. The theatrical effectfulness of the play appealed to the masses, though, it must be added, in some instances, at least, that great strides had been taken in the interpretation of the more serious import of the drama.

The faith in and the enthusiasm for the coming art had grown apace. No longer could the impatient generation wait upon the pleasure of the regular theaters and their managers. No more time remained to haggle with the æsthetic principles and moral scruples of the past. Ibsen and the native products to follow in his wake, needs must have a

[45] Heinz Tovote: *Gesellschaft,* 1889, *2*; p. 786.
[46] Stein: *Henrik Ibsen,* p. 29.
[47] Ibsen: *Samlede Værker* VI, p. VII.

means of unarrested expression. Self-expression is imperative. To this end the Free Theater (Freie Bühne) was established at Berlin.

Following the example of Antoine's *Théâtre libre* in Paris (established, 1887), a small number of German authors and critics, among them Otto Brahm, Paul Schlenther, Heinrich and Julius Hart, Fritz Mauthner, Gerhart Hauptmann, and Julius Stettenheim, formed the association to promote the new drama. Heretofore, for several decades, so it seemed to them, there had been no *German* theater. There had been a dearth of its every requisite: the actor, the dramatist, the public. Now actors had arisen, the greatest of them, Joseph Kainz.[48] The dramatist had appeared in the person of Henrik Ibsen. The public, too, was at hand. Membership in the association was open to those interested in the undertaking for the fee of thirty marks, to students for half the amount. Within a short space the total membership had increased to eight hundred members and more.

On the 29th of September, the Freie Bühne opened its doors fittingly with the production of Ibsen's *Ghosts*, the play which two years earlier had broken forever the barriers of the traditional stage. Then, on the 20th of October, followed the presentation of Hauptmann's *Before Dawn*, one of the three[49] native dramas to usher in the new theater.

A war ensued.[50] Cafés, social gatherings, newspapers and magazines provided the battlegrounds. The results were

[48] "Nora" afforded a "star" rôle. According to a writer in the *Gesellschaft* three actresses competed for the honor of being the best "Nora": Frau Friederike Gossman, Vienna, Frau Niemann-Raabe, Berlin, and Frau Conrad-Ramlo, Munich, to whom a compatriot of Ibsen would grant the palm. Hansen: *Gesellschaft*, 1888, 1; p. 488 ff.

[49] Sudermann: *Die Ehre*, 1889; Holz and Schlaf: *Die Familie Selicke*, 1890.

[50] Brahm: *Kritische Schriften*, p. 467 ff.

tremendous. Even Frenzel, as the opposition was proving hopeless, conceded the folly of closing the theaters to a movement, which, having acquired control of the novel, was certain to become master of the drama as well.[51]

1890

Every so-called new movement in literature and art has a tendency to ally or identify itself with some similar movement in the past. The Storm and Stress and the sixteenth century, the romantic movement and the middle ages afford well-known illustrations of this fact. Thus, at the close of the eighties, when Ibsen and naturalism were about to be firmly established and accepted as the new art, Germany turned back in its own history to discover, if possible, the native foundations of that art, thereby to explain and corroborate it. No long seeking was necessary to find the sources of dramatic realism in German literature. As early as 1883, the association between this source and Ibsen had been recognized.[52] It was, therefore, the charm of the new, the esoteric, plus the old, the exoteric, the known, which, according to Leo Berg,[53] assured Ibsen a success and following in Germany astonishing even to himself.

Ibsen, as Shakspere had done one hundred years earlier, led German literature to its own self-realization. In Lessing and Kleist, Ibsenian traits are discernible, even though for the greater part latent and in embryo. When Hebbel is reached, however, these traits are revealed in astonishing breadth and depth.

Berg writes:

[51] Concerning the Free Theater: Brahm: *Kritische Schriften,* pp. 51 ff., 462 ff.; Frenzel: *Deutsche Rundschau* 62, p. 316 ff; Max. Harden: *Mag. f. Lit.* 1890; p. 209 ff.

[52] See page 48.

[53] Berg: *Zwischen zwei Jahrhunderten,* p. 258 ff.

One could almost say, that Ibsen is Hebbel resurrected in a more perfect form. He is, as it were, the latter's fulfillment. Almost everything which Hebbel attempted, Ibsen achieved. What the former had wanted to do, the latter accomplished. What Hebbel darkly divined, Ibsen controls consciously and clearly. There is scarcely a second example in the history of literature where the work discontinued by one is carried on so directly by another. The one is the presupposition of the other, the latter the justification of the former.[54]

Ibsen is entirely an old German melody, the import of which remained a riddle to our forefathers, old Vischer, for example, who during his whole life admired and loved Hebbel without ever understanding him.[55]

It may not be inopportune at this point to state Hebbel's position briefly.

Hebbel's great contribution is the bourgeois tragedy in the strictest sense of the term. Established in German literature by Lessing's *Miss Sara Sampson,* 1755, and *Emilia Galotti,* 1772, this genius of tragedy was further developed by Schiller in *Love and Intrigue* (*Kabale und Liebe*), 1784. In the hands of Iffland (1759–1814) and Kotzebue (1761–1819), it degenerated into a trivial, sentimental, and coarse conflict, devoid of taste and meaning. It remained for Hebbel in *Mary Magdalene,* 1846, to invest the bourgeois tragedy with a new and serious dignity.

Hebbel was most interested in the psychological aspects of the disintegration within the bourgeoisie and thus accorded the social aspect of the problem less prominence. Afterwards, as Lessing had done before him, Hebbel abandoned his original practice. His later works, though not

[54] Leo Berg: *Zwischen zwei Jahrhunderten, Hebbel und Ibsen,* p. 260. Appendix, p. 185.

[55] Ibid., p. 272. Appendix, p. 185.

lacking modern themes,[56] are less realistic both in fable and form.

A few years after *Mary Magdalene* had been written, Otto Ludwig (1813–1865) provided another excellent specimen of moderate realism in *The Forester's Heir* (*Der Erbförster*), 1850.

To be entitled to its high rank in modern dramatic literature, the bourgeois tragedy must embody certain essential and exclusive characteristics. Without ignoring the typical aspect of the dramatic conflict, of which it should not be impoverished, the bourgeois tragedy must recognize and reproduce local color, the detailed attributes of a certain place and a certain time. *Mary Magdalene*[57] and *The Forester's Heir*[57] are, in a sense, practically timeless. They might almost be played in eighteenth century setting and costume without undue violence to the drama. The plots, though within a family, are still derived too much from personal disposition. The conflicts of society, which the characters in the later drama of this type accentuated and sym-

[56] When Dina (Selma in *The League of Youth*) says she does not want to be a thing which man simply takes unto himself (*Pillars of Society*, Act IV), she strikes the keynote of Ibsen's demand for woman. Woman is no longer to be a chattel man may purchase or accept into his keeping. Man's highest law is hers as well: Each must be himself, develop his personality. Woman reaches her greatest height when she then in ardent faith and confidence sacrifices her greatest possession, as Agnes in *Brand*, and, later, as Nora had hoped to do, in the "greatest wonder of all."

The violation of the right of woman to her personality, of which the men in Ibsen's plays are repeatedly guilty, is characteristic, too, of some of Hebbel's dramas. Mariamne, in *Herodes und Mariamne*, 1850, says: I was only a thing to him and nothing more (Act II, Scene 6); To-day my life begins, heretofore I was dreaming (Act II, Scene 5). And this same idea, that woman is an independent self, is fundamental in *Maria Magdalena*, 1846, and Hebbel's other masterpiece, *Gyges und sein Ring*, 1856.

[57] For a brief analysis of these dramas and a consideration of their position in the development of the bourgeois tragedy, see Litzmann: *Ibsens Dramen*, p. 4 ff.

bolized, are here almost forgotten in the fate of the individual.

As a matter of fact, therefore, though the novel had treated them, the drama had only grazed the social and political activities of the day. Added to this, the further fact of the personal peculiarities of both Hebbel and Ludwig and the explanation is at hand why the younger playwrights were intimidated rather than encouraged to continue upon the course really very ably begun.

But there was another reason why Hebbel should not become the leader and teacher of the next generation. The bourgeoisie was not yet aware of the powerful and growing contradictions and conflicts within itself. There was, on that account, no imminent need of a mirror in which they might be reflected. Hebbel (1813–1863), like Björnson, in spite of his artistic achievement, had come too soon. He was the child of another day.

Only after 1870 did rapidly increasing numbers, not only in public, but in private circles, occupy themselves with the social questions confronting them. Apparently defying solution, the social problem provoked continual agitation, distressing enough to older heads, peculiarly attractive, on the other hand, to the younger men.

It was the latter who deplored that now no writer seemed at hand to embody the ideals, the hopes and disappointments which stirred them. Never before in history had the magnitude of the forces at work within the lower estates been so evident, but round about the poets seemed dim of vision and dull of hearing.

Just then Ibsen appeared,— the mature artist, particularly qualified by his extraordinary sensitiveness to those very conditions, to become the great leader and teacher. Ibsen, moreover, seized upon the ethical aspect of the issue,

in distinct contrast to either Hebbel or Ludwig, which accounts in no small measure for his phenomenal power and influence.

To complete his conquest of the German stage, the dramatist of the North had yet to establish himself in the play houses of Vienna. For an hundred years and over, Vienna had enjoyed the prestige of the leading German theater, to suffer, toward the close of the nineteenth century, a temporary eclipse by the preëminence of Berlin. The political center of the German speaking peoples had become its art center.

Ludwig Anzengruber (1839–1889), in a series of realistic plays, had in a measure prepared the Viennese audiences for the naturalistic drama. Anzengruber had in fact anticipated Ibsen in the treatment of a number of motives gleaned from the biological hypotheses, which, for the time, seemed to explain the universe. In *The Fifth Commandment* (*Das vierte Gebot*), 1878, the principle of heredity had been employed in the motivation. A young wife confides to a friend, that, as her husband had exhausted his life, nothing remained for his progeny.[58] This slight stain, *Schmutzfleck*, which we

[58] This, the theme of Ibsen's *Ghosts*, is suggested in an even more striking manner in Hebbel's *Julia*, 1851. The roué, Count Bertram, is determined not to marry because he feels his life poisoned and depleted:

"I shouldn't be particularly afraid of a misalliance . . . but I do decidedly hesitate at a marriage of the living and the dead,—for that breeds ghosts!" (Act 1, scene 5.)

"How dare you ever marry? Your own son would one day challenge you to a duel for that." (Act I, scene 6.)

(*Ich scheue die Missheiraten nicht so sehr . . . aber die zwischen Leben und Tod scheue ich allerdings; denn sie ist die Mutter der Gespenster.*

Denn nie darfst du eins (*Mädchen*) *zum Weibe machen? Dein eigner Sohn würde Dich dereinst dafür auf Pistolen fordern.* Hebbel: *Werke* II, pp. 142, 143.)

Anzengruber, moreover, propounded a theory of realism distinctly modern as early as 1879. See his preface to *Dorfgänge* II.

prefer to have omitted, writes a Viennese critic,[59] has since spread itself to occupy an entire drama in which the uncertain theory is expounded as an absolute dogma.

The "magnified Schmutzfleck" made its debut in Vienna at the Deutsches Theater, November 21, 1890.

Ibsen is a great poetic genius and he has written a whole series of plays that deserve to be admired. *Ghosts,* however, cannot be counted one of them. The dramatist's audacity and ability to fashion the material into dramatic form are evident in the drama. Its technical and psychologic structure, Ibsen's art in characterization, are as exalted in *Ghosts* as in his most mature works. Yet his art was not able to ennoble the offensive, to mitigate the arbitrariness of his invention. Schiller looked upon the stage as a moral institution. Ibsen views it in *Ghosts* as a dissecting room, as an institution for the correction of society. It is not his purpose to correct us by means of beautiful moral maxims; he employs the knife of an anatomist, and by vivisecting the living beings of his plays, he demonstrates to us the fate of our offspring if we are vicious. . . . Finally, he is entangled in all the errors and caprice into which our philosophical natural scientists so often stray.[60]

The conclusion of the play, it must be admitted, is poetic and powerful. But too late did Ibsen remember that he is a creative artist. The reader may surrender to the poetic impressions of the play, but the audience in the theater has long taken flight before the sun had risen above the swampy lowlands.[61]

Never has a half-truth been defended by greater intelligence or greater talent. The idealistic drama only has consistently striven for the truth. The *pièce à thèse* has always

[59] Adam Müller-Guttenbrunn: *Dramaturgische Gänge,* p. 165 ff.
[60] Ibid., p. 166. Appendix, pp. 185, 186.
[61] Müller-Guttenbrunn: *Dramaturgische Gänge,* p. 170. Appendix, p. 186.

constructed its *dramatis personæ* to further its plea. Ibsen is the great champion of this literary genus.[62]

Ibsen's first success in Vienna had been scored in the Hoftheater, October 23rd, by the presentation of *An Enemy of the People*, the popularity of which has not diminished, it is safe to say, to the present day.

During the latter years of his activity Ibsen produced a drama, on the average, every two years. In 1890, *Hedda Gabler* left the press. It appeared in a German translation the following year. No new play of Ibsen at hand, attention was turned to his earlier efforts. On February 12th, the Deutsches Theater at Berlin revived *The Vikings at Helgeland*,[63] which, it will be recalled, passed unnoticed in 1876 In spite of the inability of the actors to impersonate adequately such heroic figures as Hjördis, Sigurd, and old Oernulf, the youthful drama did not fail to exert its dramatic power.

Although the scientific spirit had entered all fields of human thought, literary criticism had remained singularly immune, says Hermann Bahr.[64] In an essay on Henrik Ibsen, Bahr, therefore, tries to avoid the extremes of antagonist and enthusiast, and objectively answer the question: What position does Ibsen occupy in the literature of the

[62] Ibid., p. 170 ff.

[63] During the same, the fifth, decade of the century, the three great dramatists, Hebbel, Wagner, and Ibsen treated the Siegfried theme. Hebbel's trilogy *The Nibelungen* appeared in 1862, Wagner's music-drama *The Ring of the Nibelungen*, in 1853, and Ibsen's *Vikings at Helgeland*, in 1858. Siegfried's sacrifice of the woman he loved to his friend, a motive which both Hebbel and Wagner rejected, becomes the prime motive in Ibsen's version. Ibsen's characterization is modern and remains wholly within the bounds of the purely human; the Vikings are heroes of human proportions, not gods or semi-gods. Hebbel accepted mythology on the same basis with actuality. Cf. Lothar: *Henrik Ibsen*, p. 41 ff.

[64] Hermann Bahr: *Zur Kritik der Moderne; Henrik Ibsen*, p. 59 ff.

world? I. In what respects does he extend the boundaries of the past? II. In what respects does he prepare for the future?

Ibsen's strength lies in the problem-play (*Problemdichtung*), the most precious of the many acquisitions of literary individualism. Ibsen's poetic zeal is to be himself, to annihilate entirely all foreign influences upon him, to pursue his own originality without restraint. His human zeal, therefore, becomes a disdain of all outside authority, and an acknowledgment of that truth only, he himself has realized. The *summum bonum* is to be one's self. Its first literary exposition is *Brand.*

Brand is the renunciation of his poetry from all dependence and imitation. *Brand* is a burning passion with which Ibsen overcomes inherited preconception and attains to liberty. "It is a challenge to the European 'halfness,' the European half-thinking and living, which like a stray dog begs at every table." Ibsen evades no sacrifice, however great, to attain a unity of life and will. In *Brand* Ibsen is for the first time a modern man. "And he is one of the few who are so entirely."

Brand is the *modern will. Peer Gynt* is the *individualistic will,* also at enmity with half-living and thinking. *Peer Gynt* is the protest against the romantic spirit, which, though it disdains active existence, accepts the practice of bourgeoisie cowardice as the theory of all human existence. The bourgeoisie reconciled the discrepancy between ideality and reality by disposing of them as incompatible, separate sovereigns.

The problem-play is the ultimate expression of the romantic spirit. In it lies Ibsen's efficiency and talent. His keen perception of modern conditions, however, directed him to turn from romanticism. By so doing he betrayed his talent

to realize his perceptions. To conciliate these opposing forces was the problem of his life, at the same time, the problem of modern literature. Ibsen stands, therefore, at the threshold of the new literature; he is, therefore, the champion of the contemporary desire to synthesize romanticism and naturalism. Therein rests his significance.

Bahr does not share the opinion that Ibsen is a master of the naturalistic technic. Nor is Ibsen's characterization without faults and blemishes, though it is true that no one since Shakspere has created characters as intelligible, as palpable, as true to nature,— Dr. Rank, Pastor Manders, and Hjalmar Ekdal, for example. If the delineation of character is contradictory and vague, as in Nora, Stockmann, Rebekka West, the reason is to be sought in the ideas of which they are the exponents. The idea always takes revenge for being suppressed under the form of naturalism, which it disrupts. At times, therefore, the content does violence to the form; at other times, the reverse is true.

Ibsen's wealth of ideas is too great. The result is confusion. Only twice did the dramatist succeed in carrying out a problem without being diverted from it,— *Ghosts* and *The Wild Duck.*

The irresistible charm of Ibsen's plays is to be discovered in their synthesis of individualism and socialism. The promise of this synthesis is, however, never fulfilled because the tragic purification does not ensue. Ibsen's works are but a stammering revelation of the modern spirit. The final word remains unsaid.

Henrik Ibsen is a literary John the Baptist who preaches the renunciation of this present world and directs the way into the future which the savior will some time travel.

Bahr's final conclusion met with emphatic opposition from a body of patriotic literati, whose cause Berthold Litzmann

espoused in terms, if not so luminous, likewise not alternately so opaque as those of the literary scientist.

During the first year, the Free Theater had produced only two German plays. To counteract the undue approval of foreign models, such leaders of their generation as Bleibtreu and Alberti determined to establish a German Theater (*Deutsches* Theater). After some delay, this theater set out upon its mission with Bleibtreu's *Destiny*,[65] September 28, 1890. Adam Müller-Guttenbrunn's *Irma*[66] was staged the second evening; then Alberti's *Bread*,[67] the first to be received with unqualified approval. Julius Hart's *Quagmire*,[68] the next play, was a complete failure. Herman Bahr's *New Men*[69] fared little better, and the German Theater passed out of existence.

The tale of the patriotic critic had a different ending. Though not opposed to Ibsen's individual talent, Litzmann considered the influence of Scandinavia, especially as expressed through Ibsen, a direct misfortune to German letters. To transplant such peculiar characteristics to German soil is an experiment which only those having no real notion of German feelings and perception would attempt. Ibsen with his whims and idiosyncrasies is too thoroughly national. Litzmann was convinced that the literary reform could not be remedial and salutary until the overwhelming influence of the North was broken, until the German poets

[65] *Schicksal,* 1889, a drama dealing with Napoleon.

[66] Müller-Guttenbrunn (1852–). *Irma,* written in 1885, published in 1891, deals with a "misunderstood woman."

[67] Conrad Alberti (Sittenfeld, 1862–). *Brot,* 1888; revised, 1902, as *Thomas Münzer.* An attempt to portray the socialistic tendencies of the present in historic setting, the latter to idealize them.

[68] Julius Hart (1859–). *Sumpf,* 1886. The struggle of a weak character in a large city. Cf. Sudermann's *Sodoms Ende.*

[69] Hermann Bahr (1863–). *Die neuen Menschen,* 1887. Theme: Free love.

again regained the courage to rely upon their own faculties, to see things through their own eyes instead of the spectacles of Ibsenism. Ibsen provided the least suitable model the German poets could choose, both in technic and in theme. Instead of justifying the feeling of certainty and confidence which a dramatist should evoke in the reader or audience, Ibsen confuses the emotions, thus violating a cardinal technical requirement. All the characters he brings before us are diseased. "*In allen Ecken und Winkeln kichert der Wahnsinn.*" [70]

Litzmann later attributed his controversial attitude to the fear that an irrational imitation of Ibsen would be substituted for the former imitation of the classics. Relieved of these apprehensions, the critic changed his point of view, freely acknowledged in *Ibsen's Dramas* (*Ibsens Dramen*), published in 1901.

Also suggested by the Free Theater, the idea of a People's Free Theater (*Freie Volksbühne*) [71] came to Bruno Wille (1860–). Assisted by members of the society *Durch*, by Wilhelm Bölsche (1861–), the author of *The Scientific Basis of Poetry*,[72] 1887, by Otto Brahm, and others, Wille saw his social-democratic theater a reality July 29, 1890. Ibsen's *Pillars of Society* was selected for the opening performance. Hauptmann's *Before Dawn*,[73] next put upon the boards, proved to be a rather unhappy experiment. Very different, then, was the reception of *An Enemy of the People*. Dissension among the members of the association led to the

[70] Litzmann: *Das deutsche Drama*, 1894. Cf. pp. 141–161.

[71] The People's Free Theater aimed not only at one performance of any single drama, but at a number, providing an opportunity for every member of the society, which later included 10,000–15,000 subscribers, to witness (for fifty Pfennig!) each play presented.

[72] *Die naturwissenschaftlichen Grundlagen der Poesie.*

[73] *Vor Sonnenaufgang*, 1889.

organization of a New People's Free Theater, which, as well as its prototype, has continued its activity to the present. Other German cities, notably Hamburg and Vienna, afterwards established similar theaters.

1891

No other one of Ibsen's plays provoked comment to the extent of *Hedda Gabler*. Never were opinions more at variance. Those skeptical of Ibsen's dramatic talent were disposed to construe the mediocre success of *Hedda* upon the boards as an indication of the truth of their doubts. The bitter opponents of Ibsen and of naturalism perceived in the drama the positive proof of its untenable principles. Others, again, felt in duty bound to support whatever issued from the master's pen. And still others, for reasons which later years fully justified, maintained an unshaken faith in the play and its author.

On the last day of January, *Hedda Gabler*[74] was played at Munich. That evening, a critic records,[75] was a memorable one at the Residenztheater, the very first representation of *Hedda Gabler*. Our court theater, as no other, may lay claim to the merit of granting the great dramatist of the North an opportunity to speak, even in the face of the danger of being misinterpreted. The *Vikings at Helgeland*, *Nora*, *An Enemy of the People*, and *The Pillars of Society* have been played. These works of Ibsen, as some might suppose, have not been fostered because their author has been living in Munich for years, but because of their interest to the direction of the theater, and because — by no means the slightest reason — Munich possesses in the talented

[74] *Hedda Gabler*, played in London, April 20, 1891; Paris, Dec. 17, 1891; Rome, Sept. 18, 1892; St. Petersburg, 1892.

[75] W. Brachvogel: *Freie Bühne* II, p. 117 ff.

Conrad-Ramlo the greatest impersonator of Ibsenian rôles.

But neither the actors or the audience had yet measured up to the requirements of *Hedda.*

Taken as a whole the performance at Berlin,[76] ten days later, was more acceptable even if not satisfactory. The Berlin players, too, were unable to fathom profound psychic depths. "The present sad condition of the histrionic art," Brahm wrote,[77] "will undoubtedly postpone the happy possibility in which six actors may be found capable of disclosing to an audience the soul, thought, and actions of these human, all too human, beings. No wonder, therefore, that misconceptions run riot."

Brahm's subtle analysis of the character of Hedda and of the significance of the child-promise is illuminating:

The fact that she should give birth to an actual little Jörgen, to the son of her queer husband, whom she does not love, whilst Lövborg's and Thea's spiritual offspring, the great work of the future, carries their renown to the stars, drives her to her pathological deeds,— to her death. Then too, all the ugliness and involuntary drollery which her egotistic notion of the beautiful associates with motherhood,— the smiling remarks of intimates, the sick bed, perhaps, or even the loss of her mature charms —"Enough," she cries in revolt, "never shall that happen." Not able to mould her own life, she had consented to a marriage on the basis of economy. The incompatibility of the social status which had driven her to that act, and the independent will of a stronger nature, which cannot brook control, is her doom. Just at this point the seemingly narrow

[76] Certain sentences in the dialogue,—"to end it all beautifully" (*in Schönheit sterben*) and "with vine leaves in his hair" (*Weinlaub im Haar*), which had occasioned some merriment in Munich, were discreetly omitted at the Berlin première. Seven years later, at the Deutsches Theater, March 19, 1898, an expurgated version was no longer a necessary preference. Cf. Stein: *Henrik Ibsen,* p. 33 ff.

[77] Brahm: *Freie Bühne* II, p. 170 ff. *Kritische Schriften,* p. 317 ff.

psychological process becomes typical of the modern world. A social type, as Nora, as Ellida, is discernible. What the master, with a clear vision of the future, has thus created, cannot long be obscured by nonsensical remonstrances or by soulless representation. Even if Hedda Gabler now disappears from the stage, she will return. The dramatic value of the play will be discovered then.[78]

After a half dozen performances, Hedda did disappear from the stage. The public, for the time being, seemed to have no desire to solve the conundrums which the dramatist had manufactured "partly out of trickery, partly out of muddled thinking."[79] Another commentator attributed the peculiarly interesting but tantalizing aspect of Ibsen's genius to the national trait of his temperament, to the Northern reflective mood, restraint of passion, and mystic bias.[80]

The year, 1891, marks the reëstablishment of *The Pretenders*[81] in the repertory of the more prominent German theaters. Of the return of the drama to the Berlin stage, May 31st, Paul Schlenther gives the following report:

A whirring and rushing sound as of a great symphony! And this symphony is nothing more nor less than the overture to Henrik Ibsen's modern dramas. All the latter *leit-motifs* are here anticipated. When Bishop Nicholas holds the fateful letter of the priest Trond in his hands, he says: "Here, back of this thin seal lies the history of Norway for a hundred years to come. It lies and dreams, as a young bird within its egg." Similarly Ibsen's modern poetic soul lies and dreams in *The Pretenders*.

[78] Brahm: *Freie Bühne* II, p. 171. Appendix, pp. 186, 187.
[79] Frenzel: *Deutsche Rundschau* 67, p. 456.
[80] P. Schellhas: *Gegenwart* 39, p. 390 ff.
[81] See p. 31. Not played in England or France prior to 1901.

If the historical drama[82] has come to impress us as strange and foreign, so that in spite of its purely human motivation *The Pretenders* has the chilling effect upon us as a *Haupt and Staatsaction,* then Ibsen's *Wild Duck, Ghosts,* and *Nora* are mainly to blame for it. . . . The substance of art varies; themes no less than forms arise and grow old,— become obsolete. The historical drama is not in keeping with the spirit of our day. . . . That is evident, too, from the impression made by *The Pretenders.* . . . New ways lie before us, and a more refined, changed era will return to a genuine poetical conception of the historical past. Nevertheless, our theater directors and dramatists should not be dissuaded by such considerations from testing the fitness for the stage of Ibsen's greatest work, the universal drama, *Emperor and Galilean.* For this drama does not embrace a limited epoch only, it includes, as Goethe's *Faust,* the world.[83]

During the year, two other early dramas appeared on the stage for the first time: *The League of Youth,* at Berlin; *The Feast at Solhaug,* at Vienna. The former made its way upon the boards comparatively late. It was not played in Vienna until September 20, 1898 (Carl-Theater). The Lessingtheater produced it September 1, 1900, and in October of the following year the People's Free Theater gave a

[82] Piqued by some remark of Martin Greif at a festivity in Munich, Ibsen gave voice, in conversation with Lothar, to his opinion of the historic drama:

"What did this Martin Greif really mean to say? I don't understand. What sort of dramas does he write anyway? The dramas of people who have long been dead, whom he never knew. Can a dramatist write plays about people unfamiliar to him? What do the dead concern Martin Greif? He ought to let them rest in peace, and dramatize the living to his heart's content. Now he is disturbing the Bavarian sovereigns in their graves. When he has finished with them, the Hohenzollern will most likely be next in order. It is true there are enough dead princes. There is a great deal to history. But surely that is not to-day the province of the drama." Lothar: *Henrik Ibsen,* p. 127. Appendix, p. 187.

[83] Schlenther: *Freie Bühne 2,* pp. 548, 549. Appendix, pp. 187, 188.

performance of it before the members of the association.

In spite of the fact that naturalism never struck deep roots in South German soil, but a half year from the first representation of Ibsen was necessary before Vienna claimed the distinction of being the exponent, the city *par excellence*, of the modern drama. The occasion was the production of a series of Ibsen's plays beginning with *The Pretenders*, April 11th, and culminating with *The Wild Duck*, April 17th. In truth, a week of Ibsen, with a banquet at the climax.[84] Later years were destined to bring the dramatist even more brilliant and more unqualified successes in the city of theaters.

The five years under consideration brought forth numerous translations: 1887, *The Wild Duck*[85] and *Rosmersholm;*[86] 1888, *The Lady from the Sea,*[87] *The Feast at Solhaug,*[88] *Emperor and Galilean;*[89] 1889, *Love's Comedy;*[90] 1891, *Hedda Gabler.*[91] In 1889 two editions of Ibsen's complete works were begun, one by Hoffory, the other in *Reclam.*

. . . . . .

To express the new forces active in human existence in congruous and adequate forms had become early in the decade, we have noticed, the paramount problem of the generation. Other pamphleteers followed in the wake of Bleibtreu, whose *A Revolution in Literature* (1886) had

[84] Cf. Eugen Raaben: *Freie Bühne 2*, p. 448 ff.

[85] *The Wild Duck,* into English, 1891; Russian, 1892; French, 1893; Italian, 1895.

[86] *Rosmersholm,* into English, 1889; French, 1893; Russian, 1894; Italian, 1894.

[87] *The Lady from the Sea,* into English, 1890; Russian, 1891; French, 1892; Italian, 1894.

[88] *The Feast at Solhaug,* into Russian, 1896.

[89] *Emperor and Galilean,* into English, 1876; French, 1895.

[90] *Love's Comedy,* into English (selections) 1881; French, 1896; Russian, 1896.

[91] *Hedda Gabler,* into English, 1891, twice; Russian, 1891, three times; French, 1892; Italian, 1893.

reached its third edition in 1887. Only one of them, Arno Holz (1863–), who had tried his hand at the lyric, need detain us.

It was Holz's idea that art should have a natural, that is, a biological or sociological, explanation. The "experimental" art of Zola he rejected as self-contradictory,— an experiment admitted no temperament, and substituted a definition of his own (which I rather paraphrase than translate): Art has the tendency again to be nature. That attainment is dependent upon the actual conditions of reproduction, and the ability of the reproducer. "*Die Kunst hat die Tendenz wieder die Natur zu sein. Sie wird sie nach Massgabe ihrer jedweiligen Reproductionsbedingungen und deren Handhabung.*"[92]

In practice Holz accomplished most in his style, in the reproduction of natural conversation. This is best exemplified in a few sketches bearing the title *Papa Hamlet* (1889)[93] and in the drama *The Selicke Family* (1890),[93] of which contemporary drama in Germany bears many direct traces. Ibsen's style, from this viewpoint, though realistic, was not realistic enough. Ibsen's dialogue was too much manipulated; it was created rather then reproduced.

This objection was only one of several, however, which the revolutionists listed against Ibsen. Bleibtreu had taken exception to the lack of color in *The Wild Duck* and *Rosmersholm*, for instance, and had taken a decided stand against the "Ibsen-humbug" in the theaters,— against the bulletins of disease and the dialectic disquisitions on pathology. Such drama only immature heads would overestimate.[94]

What was the secret then of Ibsen's irresistible appeal?

[92] Holz: *Die Kunst*, p. 117.
[93] Johannes Schlaf collaborated.
[94] Bleibtreu: *Revolution der Literatur, dritte Auflage*, p. VII.

Several reasons may be enumerated by way of explanation.

Great art is the expression of the consciousness of an age. Every age, "despising the base degrees by which it did ascend," seeks for its own, a new truth, a new art, and a new humanity. It was in Ibsen more than in any one else that youthful Germany discovered the truth and the art of its time, and the method of their attainment. Keenly aware of the rise of new powers, Ibsen relentlessly tore asunder the old ideals that the new might spring forth in unobstructed beauty and grandeur. Like Brand he led the way up the mountain height, revealing new scenes, other views of life, of morals and art.

Modern investigations had revealed a different world. What in the past had appeared so simple had become an almost incalculable intricacy. Where a single motive had heretofore prompted man, a contradictory complex of desires and feelings now actuated him. This discovery was a drama in itself.

It was the age of science, rather, of the sciences. Biology, psychology, and sociology had laid bare the truth, and Ibsen was the most powerful exponent of this truth in dramatic form. Ibsen had wielded it into form, which others could now vary and adapt to the myriad new themes, and old themes made over.

But Ibsen was more than an iconoclast and scientist; he was a visionary, a prophet. The Germans have ever loved visions, had dreamed a hundred years ago of an ideal life, of a "third kingdom." And if not Schiller's vision of future humanity, here was a great and no less appealing promise. It is true that Zola and Tolstoy, and others, too, were seers, but Ibsen's eyes, it was divined, had seen most clearly.

Granting that he had combined so many characteristics of the age, and especially of the age in Germany, Ibsen would

yet have been found wanting but for one quality, strongly marked and equally dear to the German mind,— his emphatic assertion of individualism. The Germans are by nature individualists. Nor did he forget to portray the ever growing conflict between the individual and society, between the individual's duty to himself and his function in the social group. Civilization had complicated human existence; man could no longer exercise his personal rights without direct consequences in the social body.

Herein lies the explanation of the dissimilar and contradictory phenomena of the modern drama,— its materialism and mysticism; its democracy, autocracy, and anarchy; its individualism and socialism; its eroticism and asceticism. No matter what his predilection, the youthful author found his particular interest artistically treated in the works of Ibsen.

By 1891, therefore, the German drama had been reanimated. In the years succeeding, the German drama burst forth in profusion. Thus, to quote from a writer of those days, "historically viewed, it was a necessity, not to be averted, that Ibsen in coming to us with his modern plays should become the prototype of the German drama. What we had suspected to be the problem, we found first clearly recognized by him, distinctly expressed and artistically assimilated by him,— and I should not know in whom else those merits could have been found." [95]

[95] Albert Dresdner: *Das dritte Drama; Kunstwart* IV, p. 290. Appendix, p. 188.

CHAPTER VI

IBSEN'S LATER WORKS AND THE EFFLORESCENCE OF THE GERMAN DRAMA, 1891–1900

NO other European theater ever has approached the German theater in the eclecticism of its repertory; no other theater has so judiciously and appreciatively bestowed its consideration and praise upon the worthy products of foreign literatures. And never, it is safe to say, did the theaters of Germany present a more varied international program[1] than in the nineties of the last century.

The luxuriance of the theater was rivalled by the thrift of original production.[2] The late eighties and early nineties

1. Cf. O. Neumann-Hofer: *Das Theater in Berlin; Cosmopolis,* 1896, I; p. 286 ff.

2 Ludwig Fulda (1862–):
Das verlorene Paradies, 1890
Die Sklavin, 1891
Der Talisman, 1892
Die Kameraden, 1895
Jugendfreunde, 1897
Max Halbe (1865–):
Jugend, 1893
Mutter Erde, 1897
Otto Erich Hartleben (1864–1905):
Angèle, 1891
Hanna Jagert, 1893
Die sittliche Forderung, 1897
Carl Hauptmann (1858–):
Waldleute, 1895
Ephraims Breite, 1898
Gerhart Hauptmann (1862–):
Vor Sonnenaufgang, 1889
Das Friedensfest, 1890
Einsame Menschen, 1891
Die Weber, 1892
Hannele, 1892
Der Biberpelz, 1893
Kollege Crampton, 1894
Florian Geyer, 1895
Die versunkene Glocke, 1896
Fuhrmann Henschel, 1898
Georg Hirschfeld (1873–):
Die Mütter, 1896
Ernst Rosmer (1866–):
Dämmerung, 1894
Königskinder, 1898
Jahannes Schlaf (1862–):
Die Familie Selicke, 1890 (with Holz)
Meister Ölze, 1892
Arthur Schnitzler (1862–):
Anatol, 1893
Liebelei, 1895

had sufficed for the greater talents to serve their apprenticeship to their masters. Now they established studios of their own. The wealth of art that issued from them was astonishing. No wonder, then, that a feeling of self-sufficiency entered the German theater toward the close of the decade.

Ibsen was firmly established. The plays known were produced and reproduced, the plays still to come from his pen were awaited with expectation. Their former objections waylaid by Ibsen's practical success, the opposition designed another method of attack. Each play anew, from *Hedda Gabler* on, was designated as incomprehensible, whimsical, senile, and impossible.

Speculation arose as to the future drama. Will a coming genius perfect what Ibsen had promised? Will a synthesis of individualism and socialism, romanticism and naturalism, idealism and realism, realize a perfect art expression? Will the modern scientific world be transcended by an art capable of welding its contradictions into a higher unity?

As Goethe had summed up the century, had created a new world out of the fragmentary contributions of a hundred years, as he had stood on the threshold of a new time, foreseeing the trend of future years, so Ibsen gathered up the tendencies of his time and century and anticipated the events of the age to come.

Out of Ibsen's works breathes the spirit of the coming century, in which much will fall that we heretofore have thought the firm foundation pillars of our being. His complete rupture with

Hermann Sudermann (1857–):
Die Ehre, 1889
Sodoms Ende, 1891
Heimat, 1893
Die Schmetterlingsschlacht, 1895
Morituri, 1896
Das Glück im Winkel, 1896
Die drei Reiherfedern, 1898

Frank Wedekind (1864–):
Frühlings Erwachen, 1891
Der Erdgeist, 1895

(Authorities by no means agree on some of the dates listed above.)

the past, seemingly or really dead, in a time, which, as ours, is agitated and disquieted by the presentiment of imminent revolutions in every sphere of life, lends to Ibsen a decided modern impress.[3]

There were those who beheld in the Norwegian the great modern; others had begun to hope for another, a greater dramatist,— a new Shakspere.

At the height of his renown, Ibsen turned to his native land where he made his home — in Kristiania — for the remaining years of his life. His leaving Munich at this time (1891) suggested various interpretations to the press: he was fleeing his young followers who were now demanding respect and consideration for themselves; he had been offended by the dispute over naturalism, with which he had nothing in common. Whatever the weight of these explanations, it is an interesting fact that Ibsen's next play did portray the relation between an old master and the rising generation, *Ungdommen banker på dören.* And as a symbol of the change that had set in, Hauptmann's *Lonely Lives* (*Einsame Menschen*) appeared, a drama which obviously treats of an Ibsenian theme in a thoroughly German and individual manner.

The year, 1891, further marks the first class-room discussions of Ibsen and his works in German universities, an innovation to the credit of Emil Reich at the University of Vienna. During the winter semester of 1891–92, Reich, in a course on æsthetics, devoted some lectures to Ibsen. These were repeated the following year as an independent study. Then, in 1894, Reich's discussions appeared in book form. By 1908, they had been published in the sixth edition. Reich's point of departure, as he himself states it,[4] is not that

[3] Anon.: *Kunstwart* V, 1891–92; p. 258. Appendix, p. 189.
[4] Reich: *Ibsens Dramen,* p. XI.

of a biographer, but that of a sociologist. His particular purpose is to show that Ibsen, though an individualist at heart, proves, by means of his dramas, that extreme individualism is untenable and that a social conception of the world is necessary. In a lecture, *Ibsen and Woman's Rights*,[5] which he delivered March 19, 1891, before the Society for the Extended Education of Women,[6] Reich had stated the principal theme of his later comments and criticism. Personally, Reich considered Ibsen the "idealistic naturalist and democratic aristocrat."

Masterbuilder Solness, published in 1892, appeared in German[7] the succeeding year in a number of translations, among them the authorized version by Sigurd Ibsen, the dramatist's own son. The play became an exercise in speculation and interpretation. The unfavorable criticism, as a whole, was very moderate, due likely, as Stein[8] suggests, to an instinctive feeling that something might here be embodied of which critical intelligence as yet had no notion.

Although Ibsen's plastic power has abated, although his symbolism at times misses the mark, and although the *leit motifs* overstep the boundary between the sublime and the ridiculous, Ibsen's last drama still contains such revelations of soul, is so expressive of mood, at times so exalting, that rightly does the student seek to discover and enjoy its dark secrets. The *Masterbuilder* betrays that it is the product of age, not only in its ossified technic, also in its incomprehensible and abstract fantasticality. The abundance of individual traits, so characteristic of the earlier works, has subsided, and the former spontaneity and freshness are gone.[9]

[5] *Ibsen und das Recht der Frau.* Printed in the third annual report of the Society.

[6] *Verein für erweiterte Frauenbildung.*

[7] Simultaneously in German, English, French, Italian, Russian.

[8] Stein: *Henrik Ibsen*, p. 38.

[9] Fritz Mauthner: *Mag. f. Lit.*, 1892; p. 821.

The infirmities rather than the wisdom of age seemed apparent. There were, of course, happy exceptions to this idea:

With almost every drama of Ibsen a mystic power rises into the world from hidden realms, which assumes life in being named, and with which we long have experienced an unconscious relationship. In *The Masterbuilder* it is the *impossible*. He had once accomplished it. He had done a deed beyond the limitations of his power. This deed he recalls as something fearful and superhuman, at the same time, as the momentary fulfillment of his greatest yearning.[10]

When youth entices him to repeat the deed, the Masterbuilder ascends the steeple a second time. But mortality has ventured too far into the realms of the supermortal, and it falls. Between its incommensurable heights and depths, the human soul hovers, vacillating, indeterminate, till it precipitates its doom by the attempt of the impossible.

The most remarkable aspect of *Masterbuilder Solness* is the remarkable concentration of subject matter so superabundantly provided with problems and ideas. The play is a notable illustration of the reserve and mastery with which Ibsen materializes and vivifies his fables.[11]

All of Ibsen's works, it is the opinion of another critic, have been more or less symbolic. The *Masterbuilder* is only thus to be understood. That man cannot himself ascend to the heights of his own building is an exquisite symbol of the world reformer, of him who re-evaluates life, who establishes in theory a new existence, which he and others cannot realize.[12]

[10] Hedwig Lachmann: *Gesellschaft* IX, 1893; p. 348 ff. Appendix, p. 189.

[11] Erich Holm: *Gegenwart* 44, p. 53.

[12] Max Riess: *Gegenwart* 43, p. 40.

The initial representation [13] of the play at the Lessing-theater, Berlin, January 19th, was not a success. Neither the actors nor the audience were yet competent to exploit the occult phenomena of the soul. The *Masterbuilder* remained upon the stage, nevertheless, and by 1901 had been played in Germany thirty-seven times.

Two years passed and *Little Eyolf* [14] was put into the hands of the German public. To the habitual search for the idea, to which each play gave rise, Leo Berg remonstrated.[15]

Ibsen's depth must not be sought in the idea. It lies in the characterization and mood. And in these respects, as well as in dialogue and effectfulness, *Little Eyolf* ranks among the foremost dramatic productions not only of Ibsen, but of the century. Rarely have the deepest aspects of the soul been brought to light as in this drama.

The depth and intensity of the technic of *Little Eyolf* transcends that of *Hedda Gabler* and the *Masterbuilder*. A mystic longing for peace is discernible in the quiet, conciliatory mood of the play. The gaze is directed "toward the mountain peaks, the stars, the great calm." Similar to *Masterbuilder Solness*, *Little Eyolf* is self-revelatory. A hidden melancholy melody recurs; mortal man is earth bound. The idealist, whose strength of body and soul are inadequate, reels at his own idealistic demands.

Little Eyolf seemed not to promise much for the stage.

[13] The *Masterbuilder* was staged without delay: London, Haymarket Theater, Dec. 7, 1892; Trondhjem, and Berlin, Lessingtheater, Jan. 19, 1893; London, Trafalgar Square Theater, and Chicago (in Norse), Feb.; Kristiania, Copenhagen, Chicago (English, March; Rome, April, 1893. The première in Paris, April 3, 1894. Thereafter the play was staged in various places at diverse times. Reich states (p. 385) that the first performances were hardly a success excepting in Scandinavia and in London.

[14] *Little Eyolf* into English, French, and Russian, 1895; into Italian, 1897.

[15] Leo Berg: *Zwischen zwei Jahrhunderten, Klein Eyolf*, p. 420 ff.

This new play, Herman Bahr writes, is hardly to be called a play. It has nothing in common with the practices of the stage nor with its requisites. Only the first act is somewhat dramatic and theatrical. The remaining acts are conversations, soul communications. There is no external action. No actor can impersonate the characters, for they diffuse. Thus *Little Eyolf* is not a drama; it is a prayer.

The combination of naturalism and mysticism tends to pervert the import of the play; the profound thoughts seem nonsensical, the wisdom expressed, ridiculous. He who can fathom human thought and feeling as Ibsen in *Little Eyolf* is a great philosopher. He who can disclose his discoveries as a prayer is a great poet. But to be a great dramatist, it is necessary that the author be able to incorporate the eternal in the temporal. With this demand the drama does not comply. Moreover, "one sentence is allegorical, the next realistic, the third symbolic." The idea of the play is superb; it is deprived of effectiveness by this medley in style.[16]

Instead of Bahr's medley, Alfred Kerr is conscious of three impressions, that of the plot, that of the symbolism, that of the inner form, which transfuse and interlace into a perfect whole. Were he to reveal, he writes, what substantially remains of these impressions and stands forth, he should say — impressionistically — the perspectives of eternity,— an ineffable image of the most profound interests of existence.[17]

God is dead. Not only for the solitary ponderer. Even from the happy children of the active life has the faith been taken. This illusion has been one of many. The other illusory notions, or ideals, fall as he does. Nothing noble remains: no so-called love; nothing is eternal; no striving worth the strife; no possi-

[16] Hermann Bahr: *Vienna Theater*, p. 36 ff.
[17] Alfred Kerr: *Mag. f. Lit.*, 1894; p. 1640.

bility of happiness. The law of transmutation prevails. The coverings fall and what has appeared beautiful and bright is cold gray selfishness. Man possesses naught but himself. No two souls of the great world really belong to one another.[18]

Happiness is impossible; suffering may be assuaged. Let the sons of earth do good and wait for the great stillness.

"What I sincerely admire and revere in *Little Eyolf*," Kerr proceeds, "and what really counts, is this: the play arouses certain intuitions which enfold a direct religious puissance,—and it offers, moreover, what only the great works of the great can offer, namely, perspectives into the eternal." [19]

The first attempt to play *Little Eyolf*,[20] at the Deutsches Theater, Berlin, January 12, 1895, was a flat failure. The last act was admitted to be *beautiful*, even by those who had repudiated the Ibsenian drama for the painful absence of this requisite. By 1901, *Little Eyolf* was produced in Germany seventy-one times.

After the representation of *The Pretenders*, at Berlin, 1891, Paul Schlenther had expressed the hope [21] that Ibsen's "greatest work," *Emperor and Galilean*, be tested for the stage. On December 5, 1896, the Stadttheater at Leipsic, as the very first in any country,[22] undertook the task in an adaptation by Leopold Adler. The formidable drama of ten acts had been written in 1873, but it had attracted attention primarily as a milestone in Ibsen's literary development. In

18 Ibid., p. 1640. Appendix, p. 189.

19 Ibid., p. 1643. Appendix, pp. 189, 190.

20 *Little Eyolf* had the greatest sale and the greatest success upon the boards in Scandinavia of any of Ibsen's social dramas. It was played first in London, Haymarket Theater, Dec. 3, 1894; then in Berlin, Deutsches Theater, Jan. 12, 1895; in Kristiania, Jan. 15; in Bergen and Helsingfors, Jan. 21; in Milan, Feb. 22; Vienna, Burgtheater, Feb. 27; Copenhagen, March 13; Stockholm, March 14; Paris, May 8, 1895.

21 See page 97.

22 Not played in England or France prior to 1901.

the adaptation, the drama proved to be sufficiently theatrical to exalt the lookers on, even though (Mauthner's opinion) Julian was played as a "Heldenjüngling of Theodor Körner."[23]

The two camps of critics, whose sallies pro and con have been observed since the advent of Ibsen in Germany, were inclined to declare a truce concerning the next play, *John Gabriel Borkman*, translated and played in 1897. Sperans, in an article bearing the title *Banquier-Symbolismus* surveys the situation admirably.[24]

Sperans takes issue with the insinuation and reiteration of the discovery that Ibsen is an old man, and that his dramas, too, are old, full of whims and crotchets, fogs and oracles. Some critics had ferreted out traces of decrepitude in the *Masterbuilder*, even earlier, in *The Lady from the Sea* and in *Hedda Gabler*. Their reproach Sperans would prove void. The later Ibsen is the greatest and most powerful dramatist, able with consummate creative skill to mould the inexpressible — for those who see — with clarity and momentous import. The dramatist still has something new and significant to impart. Now more than ever before, he is in a position to subject the most audacious material to his artistic prepotency. *Masterbuilder Solness*, *Little Eyolf* and *John Gabriel Borkmann* mark the zenith of Ibsen's course.

The faith in Ibsen, vainly challenged by present criticism, is triumphant. They are fools who suppose that this man will ever send anything decrepit or feeble into the world. Should his art become impaired, the closely pressed lips will close all the more firmly, and he will remain silent. His work, too, will die in beauty and strength.[25]

[23] Harlan: *Mag. f. Lit.*, 1896; p. 1577.

[24] Sperans: *Sozialistische Monatshefte*, 1897, II; p. 87 ff.

[25] Sperans: *Sozialistische Monatshefte*, 1897, II; p. 87. Appendix, p. 190.

The repeated assurance that the later works are devoid of stage-effectiveness is no less erroneous,— except, of course, when a dull audience hurriedly snatches a little excitement between business and *souper*. To an appreciative coterie Ibsen's last creations in particular are revelations of the greatest genius. Their overpowering effect is unapproachable. I have witnessed *Little Eyolf* performed with moderate talent before an audience which possessed no other superiority than its good sense and its naïve faith in art. I never have seen another audience similarly affected. It goes without saying, that these plays exercise an influence which does not disappear in the check room. It remains with us on the street, in the home, in our dreaming and our waking. To the question, if *Little Eyolf* had pleased her, I heard some one reply at that time: I am not *yet* ready to say. This naïve confession shows the one possible approach to Ibsen.

Ibsen cannot be characterized in platitudinous formulæ. The infinite dwells within him. As in life and nature, there remains in him a trace of the unfathomable. The poetic vitality of his plays lies in their manifold meanings. A simple incident, wrought with superb technic, ascends to solemn transcendental heights. In spirit, the plays are dramatic fairy tales; in substance, they are actualities. A lyric mood envelopes the dramas, definitely outlined by an emotional coloring, though indefinite in its concrete expression.[26]

Of the masterpieces that crown Ibsen's activity, Sperans' choice falls upon *John Gabriel Borkman*, and its admirable synthesis of realism and mysticism.

Ibsen is the creator of the *modern* symbolism, which succeeds in elevating the present work-a-day world, its incidentals and lowliness, to universal significance. It is not necessary for him to take recourse to past ages and archaic

[26] Sperans: *Sozialistische Monatshefte*, 1897, II; pp. 87, 88. Appendix, pp. 190, 191.

heroes, Prometheus, Poor Henry,— an elf, or Satan — to produce an effect. He has the ability to create his own fables.

John Gabriel Borkman is the drama of capitalism, its magnitudes and deficiencies. Borkman is the symbol of capital; both are guilty of the same sin. Ibsen's individual characters are as diseased as the society in which they live. Although he contrasts the great personality with the great mass, he does not spare the former the keenness and severity of his sentence. Ibsen dreams of the great, sound, free, and noble morality of an exalted social community. His superman is fellow-man. Ibsen is not an individualist, not an anarchist, but a socialist, who beholds the good and happy individual in a society of ennobled human beings (*Adelsmenschen; Adelsmennesker*).

The technical excellence of the master is again revealed. A superficial critic might attribute to a subsidence of technical skill, and denounce, the bipartite arrangement of the last act, in which, as in a Beethoven symphony, the scene is transformed to a loftier and more distant setting. But there is no reason that the dramatist — any scribbler could re-establish the unity of the act without omitting anything essential — should renounce the decorative element which the theme freely offers.

Before Sperans' article appeared in print, *John Gabriel Borkman* [27] had been put over the boards with considerable success, first at Frankfurt on the Main, where it proved to

[27] *John Gabriel Borkmann* was done into English and French in 1897, into Russian, 1896.

It was first played in London, Dec. 1896; then in three different theaters in Finland,— at the Finnish and Swedish theaters in Helsingfors, Jan. 10, 1897; at Åbo, about the same time. Then Frankfurt, Jan. 16; Copenhagen, Jan. 17; Kristiania, Jan. 25; in the meantime in seven small Norwegian cities by the Lindberg troupe; Stockholm, also Jan. 25; Berlin, Deutsches Theater, Jan. 29; Copenhagen, Jan. 31. The première in

be a *Kassenstück*, then at Berlin and Hamburg. Its reception at the Deutsches Theater, January 29, 1897, was described as exalted, impressive, and profound. By 1901, the play had been performed in Germany one hundred and seventeen times.

The year 1898, Ibsen's seventieth anniversary, marks the genesis of the admirable translation into German of Ibsen's complete works.[28] The second volume, containing *Lady Inger of Östråt, The Feast at Solhaug, The Warrior's Barrow*, and *Olaf Liljekrans* — the last two translated for the first time — was the first to appear. Germany had become acquainted with the person and works of the old Ibsen, the Ibsen of the decided, severe, and esoteric features. As unlikely as one would picture a Byron, Mozart, or Raphael as a man full of years, so unlikely it seemed to imagine Ibsen as a young man. The freshness and youth of Ibsen's earlier plays afforded a surprising revelation, the portrait of a man, young in body and spirit,— a buoyant singer with the world his home.

The minstrel has neither house nor home,
Ne'er findeth he rest, his spirit must roam;
Holds he a soul of song in his breast,
He is homeless in valley and homeless on crest —
Be it hill or dale, he needs must sing
And needs must touch the trembling string,—
Discover the life that secretly gleams
In tossing fjords, neath thundering streams;

Paris, March 23 (private); Munich, March 27; New York, Nov. 18, 1897; later in Budapest, 1898; Bologna, 1898; Rome, 1899; Vienna, 1900.

[28] *Henrik Ibsens sämmtliche Werke in deutscher Sprache. Durchgesehen und eingeleitet von Georg Brandes, Julius Elias, Paul Schlenther. Vom Dichter autorisiert. Zweiter Band, Berlin, S. Fischer's Verlag,* 1898.

Must hear the life that ne'er was guessed,
Then clothe man's dreams that vaguely throng
And clear his seething thought in song.[29]

As a dauntless viking, Ibsen had fared forth from the confines of a pent up valley into the sunnier, brighter, and freer world. Eagerly he seized upon its promised treasures, to find, in their stead, dust and sand. Mortally wounded, the juvenile hope and faith seemed doomed to bleed to death. The lyric poet had to succumb that the dramatist might live.

After 1895, Ibsen began to recede from his former position as the central figure on the German stage. In 1898, Frenzel [30] went as far as to assert that, with the exception of an occasional presentation of *Nora* and *Ghosts*, Ibsen had almost disappeared from the boards. There was a reason for the critic's impression, though the facts at our disposal [31] would scarcely substantiate the letter of his statement. Whereas Ibsen had been one of a few modern dramatists, he was now one of many; the autochthonous drama, as noted before, had become superabundant. Young Germany had acquired of the dramatist what it wanted and needed. The battle, too, which had raged for more than a decade gradually ceased. The violent encounter concerning *Eyolf* had revealed the despair of the anti-Ibsen contingent,— the despair of a lost cause. Their utterances after this continued to yield evidence of ill-will and resignation, that peculiar *mélange* which characterizes the defeated.

[29] *Olaf Liljehrans, Act III, scene* 10. Not previously translated into English. Appendix, p. 191.

[30] Frenzel: *Deutsche Rundschau* 99, p. 281. Cf. "Gegenwart" 53, p. 205 ff.

[31] Stein tried to gather statistics of the presentations in Berlin, but did not succeed. The dramas appeared in numerous translations which were freely made use of by the play houses. Complete statistics are available only from *Masterbuilder Solness* on. Cf. Stein: *Henrik Ibsen*, p. 51.

A period of transition followed. When the Germans again turned to Ibsen their point of view had become, in a sense, that of the historian. No longer investigating what he had to offer them for their development, they considered what Ibsen had to offer for himself.

It was primarily the latter motive which prompted the staging of *Brand*,[32] first, in the Schillertheater, Berlin, March 17, 1898; then, in the Josefstädter Theater, Vienna, July 31, 1900. It will be recalled that at its initial appearance the poem had been admired for its dramatic scenes, but that the thought of putting it on the stage was dismissed. The poet himself hardly had cherished such a notion, for, when Ludwig Josephson [33] suggested it, Ibsen replied that it were not only a courageous, but a presumptuous undertaking. The presentation at the Schillertheater was not a signal success. *Brand* seemed to lack warmth. The characters seemed too abstract. One critic [34] considered the presentation a dangerous and superfluous endeavor. Later years refuted all these objections.

In honor of the dramatist's seventieth birthday, *Emperor and Galilean* was played, March 17th, at the Belle-Alliance Theater, Berlin. Director Droescher had prepared a new stage version of five acts and a prologue,— a very ungrateful task. Though respectfully received, the world-drama will be likely to remain of greater interest to the literary historian than to the practical craftsman of the theater. Frenzel [35] assigned it to the closer circle of the liberally educated, among whom, he thought, the drama would always find admirers.

[32] *Brand* played by L'œuvre, Paris, June 21, 1895.
[33] Josephson staged the dramatic poem at Stockholm, May 24, 1885.
[34] Anon.: *Gegenwart* 53, p. 222 ff.
[35] Frenzel: *Deutsche Rundschau* 95, p. 312.

The dramatic *Epilog*,[36] the last product of Ibsen's pen, was done into German in 1899. It impressed the critics as too subjective to endure the footlights. The subjectivity of the play was condemned by those to whom it seemed eccentric and strained. It was commended by others, who perceived therein an expression of tranquil immensity. In the ocean of tone of this tragedy which gathers its power from the past and its mystery, L. Lier [37] remarked, there are touching melodies. In them the melancholy motive of resignation is discernible, to which the heart responds. *When We Dead Awaken* succeeded in winning for Ibsen many who had hesitated or followed reluctantly heretofore.

The first performance [38] at the Deutsches Theater, April 17th, Brahm characterized as *rein und gross*. The audience could neither frustrate nor deny its poetic mood and dramatic power. Within a year the *Epilog* was played in Germany two hundred and fifteen times.

By 1901 all the important plays of Ibsen had been staged in the German speaking empires with the single exception of *Peer Gynt*. *Love's Comedy* [39] had been performed at the Belle-Alliance Theater, Berlin, December, 1896; a second time, by the Secessionsbühne — a new theater modeled after l' Oeuvre, for the furtherance of symbolic versus naturalistic art, Berlin, September 15, 1900. The latter presentation was a complete failure, attributed to the "folly of the theater, the hopeless impersonation, and to the antiquated comedy with its horrible thesis." To return to *Peer Gynt*,— this dramatic satire had been originally as little intended for the

[36] *When We Dead Awaken*, into English and French, 1900.

[37] L. Lier: *Kunstwart* XIII, I; p. 354 ff.

[38] Performed the same year in England, Germany, Scandinavia, Austria, Italy, Russia, not to mention a number of smaller countries. Not played in France, however.

[39] *Love's Comedy*, played in France, June 23, 1897.

theater as *Brand*. In the winter of 1873–74, Ibsen had prepared a stage version, and two years later the courageous Josephson undertook to present it, February 24, at Kristiania. Copenhagen followed, January 15, 1886; Paris, November 11, 1896; and finally, Vienna, at the Deutsches Volkstheater, May 9, 1902.

Everything Ibsen had written had been translated prior to 1901 (*Catilina*, in 1896) and, with the exception of the lyrics and some of the earlier plays, widely read. In spite of the skill which had fashioned them, Ibsen's lyric poems never had gained the recognition due them. Though possessing an incomparable wealth of lyric poetry in their own literature, cultured Germans not only had read, but had enjoyed, if we are to believe Brennert,[40] the songs of Burns, Musset, Lermontoff, Leopardi, and Petöfy. At the same time, they had remained singularly unaware of those of Wergeland, Hansen, Vinje, Björnson, and Ibsen.

The last decade of the century witnessed the publication of a number of books, a few of which deserve a word of special attention. The modern drama had not long established itself and its reputation when Max Nordau (1849–) of Budapest appeared upon the scene incriminating the entire movement. His indictment, a lengthy and detailed analysis of modern existence and its chief literary exponents, he summed up in the one word *Degeneration* (*Entartung*), 1892. Pursuing the method of his teacher Cæsar Lombroso, Nordau wished to enlighten the world by applying to its extravagances the test of a sane and normal mind. Political and social criminals have no monopoly of lunacy and degeneracy; these are quite as common among artists and literati. The current enthusiam for the pathological tendencies in art and literature is nothing more than the insignia

[40] H. Brennert: *Ibsen als Lyriker, Gegenwart* 45, p. 182 ff.

of the more or less pronounced moral insanity, imbecility, and dementia, which have become the rule rather than the exception. Degeneration is characterized by various grievous fashions, among them Ibsenism, alias, ego-mania.

Having satisfactorily pigeon-holed Ibsen, Nordau devotes about one hundred pages to him, acknowledging the dramatist's unquestionable ability, emphasizing and illustrating the unmistakable indications of deterioration. And the conclusion of the whole matter — which must be read to be appreciated — is this: May Ibsen remain in company with those of his spirit, that is to say, with hysterical women and masculine masochists, with those who believe that sound common sense and optimism are two destructive principles of poetry.

To counteract the popular impression of Ibsen's being a realist, Adalbert von Hanstein published a series of lectures delivered at the Humboldt Academy in Berlin, in book form, bearing the title, *Ibsen as an Idealist*, 1897. Though early adjudged an idealist,— without quibbling about the exact signification of the term — by his more competent students, Hanstein was the first to state explicitly that Ibsen was not only indifferent to, but opposed to a materialistic *Weltanschauung*, a realistic philosophy, and a naturalistic art. This fact admitted, the student would no longer find the later dramas conundrums defying a solution.

Hanstein's contention received reliable support in Axel Garde's disquisition, *The Basic Thought in Henrik Ibsen's Writings*, translated from the Danish original in 1898.

The first volume of Roman Woerner's fairly extensive study of Ibsen, which pursues the dramatist's career to 1873, left the press in 1900. The following year brought forth a number of discussions.[41] Henceforth, the various publications

[41] See Table B, p. 171.

sought to explain Ibsen, and to assign him his just place in the progress of dramatic literature.

. . . . . .

Since 1886, the drama, especially the acting-drama, had rapidly increased in quantity and quality, until in 1897, it occupied the central interest in German letters. During the comparative inanition of the drama, the novel and short story had flourished and had become the chief literary expression of German life and culture. Karl Frenzel [42] would attribute the phenomenal rise of the acting-drama to the eclecticism of the Berlin theaters. The imperative need of the play is proper impersonation and adequate scenic presentation. These requisites, without which all the talent of the modern school, Ibsen not excluded, would have passed into oblivion, the abundance and versatility of the Berlin theaters supplied.

The German drama had become independent, differing from the Ibsenian model both in form and content. A naturalistic dialogue had superseded the Ibsenian. Simultaneously the mathematical construction of the latter gave way to a loosely connected series of incidents, or cinematographs, best exemplified in *The Selicke Family* and *The Weavers.*[43] It was felt that the more mathematical the play, the further it was likely to be removed from actual life, from sense-perceived existence, to the representation of which the German naturalists at first consecrated themselves. At their hands the minutest detail received loving attention,— characterizing their plays by an intimacy with homely, every-day experience, scarcely duplicated elsewhere. But one virtue is often the price of another; for its immediacy the German drama forfeited breadth of horizon and wealth of idea.

[42] Frenzel: *Deutsche Rundschau* 91, 1897; p. 138 ff.
[43] Hauptmann: *Die Weber* (*De Waber*), 1892.

Later, therefore, the German playwrights turned from the mere reproduction of the *états des choses* to the contemplation of the *états d'âmes*,—which had always been Ibsen's primary concern.

The naturalistic movement was short-lived. As early as 1891, Bahr had asserted, "Naturalism is surmounted,"[44] and two years later, Hauptmann, the typical heir and representative of the generation, illustrated the statement in *The Assumption of Hannele*.[45] With considerable technical skill, the dramatists here attempted a synthesis of naturalism and mysticism, of the objective and subjective aspects of life. Ibsen had introduced various phases of soul-life in the plays from *Rosmersholm* on, and in *The Masterbuilder* he had practically anticipated the entire symbolic movement.

Whether realistic or symbolic, Ibsen had insisted upon truthfulness of characterization and upon uprightness of technique. Herein lay the vitality of his contribution to modern Germany. He goaded the young writers into truth at a time when art had lost its sense of truth. He spurred them on to seriousness when the age was flabby, to action when the epoch seemed stagnant, to courage when the generation was weak. "Therefore, we may call him the primogenitor of our new drama, and thank him, as the old Hebrews, 'with our whole heart, our whole soul, and with our whole mind.'"[46]

[44] *Die Uberwindung des Naturalismus.*

[45] *Hanneles Himmelfahrt.*

[46] *Darum dürfen wir ihn wohl den Ahnherrn nennen für unser neues Drama und ihm danken, wie die alten Juden, von ganzem Herzen, von ganzer Seele und vom ganzem Gemüt.* Kerr: *Der Ahnherr; Neue deutsche Rundschau* VII, 1896, 2; p. 297 ff.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

ALTHOUGH German literature in general bore, more or less, a stamp of uncertainty during the seventies, the drama and the theater seemed especially indeterminate. Accordingly, Frenzel, in 1877, raised the question: Is the German theater about to enter upon a new and creditable course of development, or is it at present upon the inclined plane from which the English theater has rolled down into the depths? [1]

Faithful to the classics — to their titles, at least — the court theaters rejected the plays of the younger and more ambitious playwrights, and continued for the time being quite undisturbed by the (Frenzel [2] thinks exaggerated) accusations of partiality, ill-will, conservative political views, considerations for the court, and want of judgment.

It was in the greater liberality of the popular theaters (*Volkstheater*) that the young and radical generation perceived the possible realization of the new drama. The rise of these same theaters, to the conservatives, portended the mid-night hours after the twilight. To submit to the popular theaters was to court farce and banish tragedy, to court license in speech and action instead of gravity and dignity. It was feared that libertinism of the stage would increase in proportion to the degeneration of taste, and since the proletariat was increasing in power from day to day, barbarism

[1] Frenzel: *Die Zukunft des deutschen Theaters, Dramaturgie II*, p. 421.
[2] Ibid., p. 423.

and the ultimate ruin of the German theater were inevitable.

During the years when the good genius of German literature had turned from the stage, the French play of manners took possession of it, nor was there, seemingly, any autochthonous drama to offer any opposition. Few flowers and less fruit; poor drama and poor presentation: such was, in brief, the status of the theater. Before the close of the decade, however, the Meininger had supplied the histrionic qualifications.

But the prime requisite was wanting. No new, theatrically effective play seemed forthcoming,— no play, as Frenzel[3] demanded, sensational and virile enough to provide a subject for a three weeks' debate in the papers, at the social teas, and among those standing at the street corner.

The German classics lay as a paralyzing weight upon the drama. Even Hebbel never had succeeded entirely in freeing himself from their influence. Since the days of Goethe and Schiller, the cultural life of Germany had experienced, however, revolutionary changes; human interests had been readjusted and re-evaluated. Facts and ideals had changed. Failing to discover any possible conciliation between the past and present dispensations, the prevailing literary school held to the former. Severed from the vital forces of the time, its epigonous literature as a matter of course degenerated into academicism and conventionalism.

The accumulating realistic forces, best represented in Hebbel and Ludwig, later, in Anzengruber, were scarcely accorded recognition, to say nothing of their exerting any extensive or permanent influence. Nor was the realistic tendency developing in literature independent of these talents destined to progress very far. The successful wars of the sixties and of 70–71 had generated a national and patriotic

[3] Frenzel: *Die Zukunft des deutschen Theaters, Dramaturgie II,* p. 455.

interest which the subsequent founding of the Empire continued to propagate, and which for the time cut across the natural evolution of realism.

The advance of industrialism, under the support and direction of the bourgeoisie, too, had given rise to a literature. This, supplying the demands of those for whom it was primarily intended, precluded by its very nature any drama of breadth and depth.

There is still a third reason why German literature, especially the drama, had to suffer the influence of foreign literatures, even of those considered degenerate, barbarous, and insignificant. The attempt at a *social* literature during the seventies was frustrated by a convention which had entered and assumed control of various aspects of German life besides the literary. In the meantime, the treatment of social themes had received an impetus in other European countries: first of all, in England, witness Kingsley and his contemporaries; then, in France, Russia, and Scandinavia.

Zola's *Nana* broke the way for social literature in Germany. Its brutal force appealed to the younger minds. The Russians then revealed another aspect of society, equally interesting, in the portrayal of mystic and pathological figures against the contrasting background of a vigorous folk, in short, in the portrayal of a highly attenuated civilization, on the one hand, and an uncivilized humanity, on the other. Then most interesting of all, and most influential of all, because visionary as well as immediate, the Scandinavians, who uncovered the social lie and pointed to the great, strong, and free social community of the future. Ibsen met, moreover, the practical requirement of the day,— a drama which would occupy the public even at the street corners.

Reacting against the imitation of the classics, the new generation demanded a literature consciously true to fact,

to actuality. What the precise nature of the new drama was to be remained for some time until after 1885, more or less a matter of conjecture. There were divergent opinions. But common to all youthful authors, in addition to their especial sensitiveness and impressionableness — in fact, resulting from them — was their method of writing. They appealed to and shocked the senses; truth at whatever cost, truth irrespective of conventional ethics or æsthetics. There seemed to prevail a keen delight, a nervous and hysteric satisfaction, to uncover what the immediate forebears had tried to conceal or evade.

Just a hundred years earlier, the history of German literature had recorded a similar movement, with at least one trenchant difference, between them, however. The Storm and Stress had been peculiarly national in temper; the recent reaction was conspicuously international, in the minds of some, even anti-national.[4]

This peculiar international flavor had pervaded the ideas of Europe particularly after the dissemination of the Darwinian theories of life and evolution (*Origin of Species*, 1859). To nationalize these ideas required at once a talent original and great enough to embody them in such a way as to emphasize those aspects compatible with the national spirit of a country, at the same time, to subdue or reject those phases or interpretations not in harmony with that spirit. Until subjugated to national taste and feeling, any influence must remain to a greater or less degree a foreign yoke.

The nature of the problem confronting young authors was twofold. The international ideas needed to be naturalized, that is, they must be recognized in and colored by the national life of a people. Purely sectional incidentals needed to be

[4] Cf. Bartels: *Die deutsche Dichtung der Gegenwart*, p. 244. Litzmann: *Das deutsche Drama*, p. 141 ff.

considered as contributions to the ultimate art product.

Theory prepared the way for practice. Nature and truth, as ever before, were the watchwords of the new gospel. Truth now, however, was coincident with actuality. Realism, and what was later specifically designated naturalism were scarcely differentiated, and idealism still sang its tune in the medley.

The nineteenth century Storm and Stress had quite spent itself by 1890. Primarily lyric in its nature,[5] it had fostered individualism. Each writer sought to precipitate the values of the epoch as he perceived them. Late in the eighties the somewhat erratic and confused groping after the new manner gave way to a rather definite method. Holz and Schlaf were its originators, and Hauptmann named it consistent, " consequent " realism.[6]

To Holz and Schlaf the new German drama owes its technique to a great extent. Schooled by Zola, they supplanted the drama of action by the drama of milieu, but not before Ibsen had well prepared the way for the change.

The new movement began in iconoclasm. But no iconoclast approached the ruthlessness and fearlessness of Henrik Ibsen. It was he who taught *Jüngst Deutschland* most effectively to tear down the old structures of society and art and to expose the rotten foundations upon which they were resting. His dramas, moreover, were inspiring examples.

Deeply felt, though perhaps not consciously recognized by the young generation, Ibsen served as a prototype in the nationalization of current ideas. The later ideal of *Heimatskunst*, Ibsen had long anticipated. The small city of Skien, his birthplace, had provided him with many experiences from which store he drew again and again. In this small commun-

[5] Cf. Bartels: *Die deutsche Dichtung der Gegenwart*, p. 260.
[6] Cf. dedication in Hauptmann's *Vor Sonnenaufgang*, 1889.

ity, Ibsen discovered the conflicts which in his dramas assumed not only European, but world-wide proportions. In its circumscribed society, Ibsen found many of the personalities which in his works became typical of the century. His intimacy with the soil of Norway, his national strength, in no small measure accounts for the source and the secret of his achievement.

To Hermann Sudermann (1857–), whose literary forebears are Dumas *fils* and his contemporaries, rather than Zola or Ibsen, belongs much of the credit of ushering in the new German drama. By embodying just enough of the new to add piquancy of flavor and by retaining enough of the old-fashioned to please and to satisfy, it was he who engaged popular interest for the coming drama. Gerhard Hauptmann became its greatest artist.

As the individual authors had extracted from Ibsen those themes and methods consistent with their personal inclination, so the critics and pamphleteers drew from him whatever promised to further their contentions. Ibsen was, accordingly, prophet, seer, and teacher; realist, naturalist, idealist; individualist and socialist. Philosophy was discovered everywhere, and where philosophy was scarce, symbolism was abounding.

Apropos of the latter, Ibsen once expressed himself in conversation with Lothar:

> Yes, indeed, the interpreters. They don't always do their work well. They like to symbolize because they have no respect for actuality. And if a symbol is really handed to them, they make it trivial and disgrace one.[7]

[7] "*Ja, wahrhaftig, die Erklärer. Die machen ihre Sache nicht immer gut. Die Symbolisieren gern, weil sie keinen Respect vor der Wirklichkeit haben. Gibt man ihnen dann wirklich ein Symbol in die Hand, dann machen sie eine Trivialität daraus und schimpfen.*" Lothar: *Henrik Ibsen*, p. 126.

Ibsen presented a profusion of conflicting ideas — Schopenhauer and Nietzsche in one. How to adjust them and weld them into a system became a task of absorbing interest in which the artist's prerogative to portray a situation from any point of observation he might choose, was quite overlooked. As a result, critical minds found themselves in a recurring dilemma, which they preferred to attribute to the confused thinking of the dramatist. To the very close of the century, therefore, and later, the drama of ideas persisted in the minds of many as ideas rather than drama. Against this dispensation, Ibsen justly remonstrated.

In regard to *Rosmersholm*, for instance, he wrote:

> The call to work undoubtedly pervades *Rosmersholm*.
>
> Even more, however, does the play deal with the struggle which every serious human being has to wage with himself in order to bring his life into concord with his knowledge. . . .
>
> But first and foremost, the play is, of course, a *digtning* (poesy, *Dichtung*) of human beings and their fate.[8]

In a letter to Count Prozor, his French translator, he wrote apropos of *Hedda Gabler:*

> It was not really my desire to deal in this play with so-called problems. The chief thing to me has been to portray men, their sentiments, and destiny upon the basis of certain existent social conditions and (accepted) principles.[9]

The spirit of *A Doll's House* and of *Ghosts* is no different. And in the last, the symbolic dramas, Ibsen's original purpose as the artist was not forgotten or less effective. The shadows and the mists of the later plays are lifting and dispersing since the determination to read into them more of the

[8] *Breve fra Henrik Ibsen II*, p. 168. Appendix, p. 191.
[9] Ibid., pp. 193, 194. Appendix, p. 192.

secret and suggestive than the author ever dreamed of, has abated. When Ibsen in his *Dramatic Epilog* proclaims that he who has lived for art only has not found happiness, he utters — if it may be construed at all as personal — his own sentence.[10]

Had Ibsen become generally known by any other than his social dramas — which at that epoch would hardly have been likely — he might have been spared the misinterpretations of his German readers and students, their speculations and guesses which bring to mind the early opinions of the *Second Part* of *Faust*. As it was, the Ibsenian dramas compelled an explanation, and the various endeavors to elucidate this or that point to the public were no less serious attempts to clarify the minds of the critics as well.

While the latter were engaged in interpreting and expounding Ibsen, and while the public was being repeatedly and for the most part willingly shocked and excited, the young creative minds were attracted as by a lodestone. Here was something definite, a new world from the chaos of modern forces which youthful Germany had felt without being able to formulate. With the assistance of the dramaturgists friendly to the new movement, the stage became, as for *Faust Part Two*, the important agency of a better understanding of the poet and his purpose.

This is not to be construed, however, that the success of any one play was its best critic,— a dogma which such echo who follow rather than direct the public taste. The early performances of any one drama were often promoters of mis-

[10] Though the poet's statement of what he intended is by no means a final settlement of what he presented, his serious opinion is likely to be as weighty as that of the average critic. Cf. Anon.; "*Kunstwart*" XI, 2, 1898; p. 188 ff.

Compare Rubek in *When We Dead Awaken* with Einar in *Brand*, who is first all artist, then all moralist.

understanding. Ibsen was confronted on the stage with various obstacles,— the dogmatism of æsthetic orthodoxy, political and religious scruples, not to mention the practical difficulties. His success in surmounting them all in due time is an astonishing testimony of the compelling power of his life-work.

The plays appearing after *Hedda Gabler*, that is, after 1891, no longer aroused the contest and enthusiasm of their predecessors. Ibsen's significance, on the other hand, continued to increase; this was not dependent upon the theater. The old school which had held so tenaciously to its ideals, and which had looked askance at a rejuvenation of the German drama through untried and untempered means, gradually acknowledged defeat.

But the actual triumph of Ibsen on the German boards was postponed until 1904, when Otto Brahm became the director of the Lessingtheater at Berlin. Here through his insight and skill, adequate representations were offered to the satisfaction of the public and the honor of the dramatist.

As an apology, or as a self-justification, it is not unusual to encounter in German criticism the assertion that the modern German drama would have developed from the realistic novel [11] without the influx of foreign stimuli. That is in all probability true. What the resulting drama would have been is and remains conjecture. As facts stand, the novel [12] did not always profit by the virtues of the extraneous prototypes, but, in some instances, at least, even lagged behind

[11] After 1848 the German drama had to cede first place in letters to the novel, both in significance and in popularity. Gutzkow no longer harvested the successes of the earlier days, and Hebbel's *Nibelungen* did not rise to the height of *Maria Magdalena* and *Judith*. Cf. Frenzel: *Dramaturgie* I, p. 4 ff.

[12] Cf. R. M. Meyer: *Die deutsche Literatur des XIX Jahrhunderts*, p. 737 ff.

the drama. The controversy would carry us beyond the province of this treatise; suffice it to say, therefore, that any apology for Ibsen in Germany is quite superfluous.

There may be some weight in the further argument, occasionally advanced, that Ibsen was fundamentally not a foreigner. It is likely that a racial sympathy might have been felt for him, which was not experienced for Zola or Tolstoy. The contention, however, would scarcely bear much strain.

A busy day is a short day at the time; in retrospection, on account of its many happenings, it seems long. Similarly, the reader of the foregoing pages may feel that the appreciation of Ibsen in Germany was a somewhat drawn out process. Compared to the reception of Hebbel or Kleist, and Goethe's *Werther* or *Faust*, that of Ibsen was surprisingly prompt. This assertion finds further support in the profound influence — though that is not the problem of this dissertation — he exerted in Germany, which influence was no mere fad, but a power which made Ibsen, no matter how interpreted, an integral and significant part of the modern German drama.

As Shakspere finally became through the masterly translations of the romanticists, and through the response to him in the German soul, a prominent figure in German letters, so Ibsen a century later — without carrying the parallel too far — was incorporated in that literature as part of itself. To-day Ibsen belongs to the stage, to the literature, and to the culture of Germany.

But that is not all. Had the dramatist of the North been annexed to Germany only as so much territory, the acquisition would have been valuable enough, but, Ibsen performed a service. He assisted youthful Germany, by liberating it, to express itself,— and self-expression is self-realization.

APPENDIX

TABLES

TABLE A

Drama [1]	Date of Pub.	First German Trans.	First Prod.	First Prod. in Germany
Catilina	1850	1896, Leipsic, Munich Hugo Greinz	1881 Stockholm	
Gildet paa Solhaug The Feast at Solhaug Das Fest auf Solhaug	1856	1888, Leipsic Emma Klingenfeld	1856 Bergen	1891 Vienna
Fru Inger til Østråt Lady Inger of Östråt Die Herrin von Oestrot	1857	1877, Munich Emma Klingenfeld [2]	1855 Bergen	1878 Berlin
Hærmændene paa Helgeland The Vikings at Helgeland Die Helden auf Helgeland	1858	1876, Munich Emma Klingenfeld [2]	1858 Kristiania	1876 Munich
Kjærlighedens Komedie Love's Comedy Komödie der Liebe	1862	1889, Berlin M. v. Borch	1873 Kristiania	1896 Berlin
Kongsemnerne The Pretenders Die Kronprätendenten	1864	1872, Berlin Adolf Strodtmann	1864 Kristiania	1875 Meiningen [3]
Brand	1866	1872, Kassel P. F. Siebold	1885 [4] Stockholm	1898 Berlin

[1] Kæmpehöjen (The Warrior's Barrow, Das Hünengrab), Olaf Liljekrans, and other less promising, early efforts were not admitted to any edition prepared by the dramatist himself, and are not of sufficient importance to consider in this table.

[2] Collaborator.

[3] Cf. Ibsen: *Samlede Værker II,* pp. XI, XII. Arnold: *Das moderne Drama,* p. 149 records 1876 as the year of the first performance. Emil Reich: *Ibsens Dramen,* Dresden, 1906; p. 48, corroborates the date here given.

[4] First produced in its entirety; the fourth act had been presented a number of times prior to this date.

Drama [1]	Date of Pub.	First German Trans.	First Prod.	First Prod. in Germany
Peer Gynt	1867	1881, Leipsic L. Passarge	1876 Kristiania	1902 Vienna
De unges Forbund The League of Youth Der Bund der Jugend	1869	1872, Berlin A. Strodtmann	1869 Kristiania	1891 Berlin
Kejser og Galilæer Emperor and Galilean Kaiser und Galiläer	1873	1888, Leipsic E. Brausewetter Berlin Paul Hermann	1903	1896 [5] Leipsic
Samfundets Stötter The Pillars of Society Die Stützen der Gesellschaft	1877	1878 [6]	1877 Odense, Denmark	1878 Berlin
Et Dukkehjem A Doll's House Ein Puppenheim	1878	1880, Leipsic Wilhelm Lange	1879 Copenhagen	1880 Munich
Gengangere Ghosts Gespenster	1881	1884, Leipsic M. v. Borch	1882 [7] Chicago	1886 Augsburg
En Folkefiende An Enemy of the People Ein Volksfeind	1882	1883, Leipsic W. Lange	1883 Kristiania	1887 Berlin
Vildanden The Wild Duck Die Wildente	1884	1887, Berlin M. v. Borch Leipsic E. Brausewetter	1885 Bergen	1888 Berlin
Rosmersholm	1886	1887, Berlin M. v. Borch Leipsic A. Zinck	1887 Jan. 17 Bergen	1887 April 6 Augsburg
Fruen fra Havet The Lady from the Sea Die Frau vom Meere	1888	1888, Berlin Julius Hoffory	1889 Feb. 12 Kristiania	1889 Feb. 12 Weimar

[5] Adaptation (Bearbeitung).

[6] Many translations, among them: Emma Klingenfeld's, Munich; W. Lange's (Reclam); Emil Jonas' version for the stage, Berlin.

[7] Ibsen: *Samlede Værker VI*, p. XXXI.

Drama [1]	Date of Pub.	First German Trans.	First Prod.	First Prod. in Germany
Hedda Gabler	1890	1891, Berlin E. Klingenfeld [8]	1891 Munich	1891 Munich
Bygmester Solness Masterbuilder Solness Baumeister Solness	1892	1893, Berlin [9] Sigurd Ibsen	1892 London	1893 Berlin
Lille Eyolf Little Eyolf Klein Eyolf	1894	1895, Berlin	1894 London	1895 Berlin
John Gabriel Borkman	1896	1897, Leipsic Munich Sigurd Ibsen	1896 London	1897 Frankfurt am Main
Når vi døde vågner When We Dead Awaken Wenn wir Toten erwachen	1899	1899, Berlin Christian Morgenstern	1899 London	1900 Stuttgart

[8] Simultaneously, a number of translations: von Borch, Leipsic; Victor Ottman, Halle a. d. S.; S. Fischer, *Nordische Bibliothek,* Berlin.

[9] Also: V. Ottmann, Leipsic; Paul Hermann, Halle a. d. S.

TABLE B, IBSEN

Chronology of Published Translations, Significant

Year	Translations	Plays Presented
1868	*Poems*	
1872	*Brand* *The Pretenders* *The League of Youth*	
1873		Björnson: *Between the Battles*
1874	Brand	
1875		Björnson: *A Bankruptcy*

[1] The initial productions, in italics.

Productions,[1] Critical Comment, and Bibliography.[2]

Where Presented	Critical Comment	Books, Essays
	H., J.: Henrik Ibsen, ein norwegischer Dramatiker; *Mag. f. d. Lit. d. Auslandes* 82, p. 367 ff.	
Berlin, Friedrich-Wilhelmsstädtische Bühne, spring.	Frenzel, K.: *Deutsche Rundschau* 6, 1876; p. 138. Frenzel, K.: *Berliner Dramaturgie II*, p. 125 ff. H., G.: H. Ibsen und sein dramatisches Gedicht *Brand; Mag. f. d. Lit. d. Auslandes* 86, p. 454 ff.	Strodtmann, A.: *Geistiges Leben in Dänemark*, Berlin
Berlin, National-theater.	Frenzel, K.: *Deutsche Rundschau* 6, 1876; p. 138 ff. Lindau, P.: *Gegenwart* 8, p. 369.	

[2] The bibliography here listed approaches completeness.

Year	Translations	Plays Presented
1875, con.		Björnson: *The Newly-Married Couple*
		Ibsen: *The Pretenders*
1876	*The Vikings at Helgeland*	*The Vikings*
		The Pretenders
1877	*Lady Inger of Östråt*	
1878	*The Pillars of Society*	*The Pillars of Society*
1878,		*Lady Inger*
1879	*A Doll's House*	

Where Presented	Critical Comment	Books, Essays
Munich, Hoftheater, May.	Aue, T. v. d.: *Gegenwart* 8, p. 91 ff.	
Meiningen		
Munich, Kgl. Theater		
Schwerin, i. M., Hoftheater, Nov. 15.		
Munich, Hoftheater, April 10.		
Vienna, Burgtheater, Oct. 26.		
Dresden, Hoftheater, Oct. 27.		
Berlin, by the Meininger, June 3	Frenzel, K.: *Deutsche Rundschau* 8, p. 154. Frenzel, K.: *Berliner Dramaturgie II*, p. 144 ff.	
Berlin, Belle-Alliance Theater, Jan. 25. Stadttheater, Feb. 2. Nationaltheater, Feb. 3. Ostendtheater, Feb. 6. Reuniontheater, Feb. 6.	Frenzel, K.: *Deutsche Rundschau* 14, p. 485 ff.	
Berlin		

Year	Translations	Plays Presented
1880		*A Doll's House*
1881	*Peer Gynt* Poems	
		A Doll's House
1882		
1883	*An Enemy of the People*	
1884	*Ghosts*	
1885		

Where Presented	Critical Comment	Books, Essays
Munich, Residenztheater, March 3.		Horn, F. W.: *Geschichte der Literatur des scandinavischen Nordens,* Leipsic
Berlin, Residenztheater, Nov. 20.	Frenzel, K.: *Deut. Rundschau* 26, p. 306 ff. Lindau, P.: *Gegenwart* 18, p. 346 ff.	
Hamburg, Thaliatheater		
Dresden, Kgl. Theater		
Hannover, Residenztheater		
	Brunn, E.: *Mag. f. Lit. d. Auslandes* 99, p. 73 ff. Wichert, E.: *Im neuen Reich* 1880, 2; p. 889 ff.	Sierke, E.: *Kritische Streifzüge,* Braunschweig Zabel, Eugen: *Henrik Ibsen; Unsere Zeit* 1881, 1; p. 513 ff.
Vienna, Stadttheater		
	Passarge, L.: *Mag. f. Lit. d. Auslandes* 103, p. 98 ff. Zolling, T.: *Gegenwart* 23, p. 232 ff. Brahm, O.: *Kritische*[4] *Schriften,* p. 73 ff.	Brandes, G.: *Henrik Ibsen; Nord und Süd* 27, p. 247 ff. Passarge, L.: *Henrik Ibsen,* Leipsic

[4] Reprints of newspaper articles.

Year	Translations	Plays Presented
1886		*Ghosts*
	Poems [3]	
1887		Ghosts

[3] *Gedichte. In deutschen Nachbildungen von Herm. Neumann,* Wolfenbüttel.

Where Presented	Critical Comment	Books, Essays
Augsburg, April 14 (Private). Meiningen, Dec. 22.		Brahm, O.: *Henrik Ibsen; Deut. Rundschau* 49, p. 193 ff.
	Jonas, Emil: *Mag. f. Lit. d. Auslandes* 109, p. 293.	Schmidt, R.: *Skandinavische Litteraturbriefe; Mag. f. Lit. d. Auslandes* 109, 1886, 1; pp. 35 ff., 246 ff.
	Conradi, H.: *Gedichte von Henrik Ibsen; Deut. akad. Zeitschrift,* June 6. (Gesammelte Werke II, p. 325 ff.)	
Berlin, Residenztheater, Jan. 9.	Berg, L.: *Gesellschaft* 3, 1887, 1; p. 230 ff. Brahm, O.: *Kritische Schriften,* pp. 73 ff., 104 ff. Fontane, T.: *Causerien,*[5] p. 180 ff.	Bahr, H.: *Henrik Ibsen,* Vienna Berg, Leo: *H. Ibsen und das Germanentum in der modernen Litteratur,* Berlin
	Borinski, K.: *Gespenster, ein Gespräch; Grenzboten* 1887, 1; p. 321 ff. Frenzel, K.: *Deut. Rundschau* 51, p. 464 ff.	Brahm, O.: *Henrik Ibsen,* Berlin Malkowsky, G.: *Henrik Ibsen als Lyriker; Gegenwart* 31, p. 300 ff. Sierke, E.: *Henrik Ibsen und der Realismus auf der Bühne, Unsere*

[5] Reprints.

Year	Translations	Plays Presented
1887, con.		
		An Enemy of the People
		Rosmersholm
	Rosmersholm	

Where Presented	Critical Comment	Books, Essays
	Malkowsky, G.: *Gegenwart* 31, p. 45 ff. Sierke, E.: *Unsere Zeit,* 1887, 2; p. 187 ff.	*Zeit,* 1887, 2; p. 185 ff.
Berlin, Ostendtheater, March 5.	Berg, L.: *Gesellschaft,* 3, 1887, 2; p. 658. Brahm, O.: *Kritische Schriften* p. 121 ff. Frenzel, K.: *Deut. Rundschau* 51, p. 464 ff.	
Augsburg, April 16.	Lindau, P.: *Nord und Süd* 42, p. 267 ff.	
Berlin, Residenztheater, May 5.	Anon.: *Unsere Zeit,* 1887, 1; p. 840 ff. Berg, L.: *Gesellschaft,* 3, 1887, 2; p. 658 ff. Brahm, O.: *Kritische Schriften,* p. 130 ff. Brand, J.: *Gesellschaft,* 4, 1888, 2; p. 1130 ff. Bulle, O.: *Ibsens ideale Forderung; Gegenwart* 32, p. 295 ff. Marholm, L.: *Gegenwart* 31, p. 7 ff. Sierke, E.:	

Year	Translations	Plays Presented
1887, con.		
	The Wild Duck	
1888		*The Wild Duck*
	The Lady from the Sea *The Feast at Solhaug*	

Where Presented	Critical Comment	Books, Essays
	Unsere Zeit, 1887, 2; p. 199 ff. Willfried, L.: *Gesellschaft*, 3, 1887, 2; p. 748 ff. Anon.: *Kunstwart* 1, 87–88; p. 284 ff. Brand, J.: *Gesellschaft*, 4, 1888, 2; p. 1134 ff. Marholm, L.: *Gegenwart* 31, p. 7 ff. Schmidt, R.: *Mag. f. d. Lit.* 109, 1886, 1; p. 36.	
Berlin, Residenztheater, March 4.	Brahm, O.: *Kritische Schriften*, p. 158 ff. Fontane, T.: *Causerien*, p. 189 ff. Frenzel, K.: *Deut. Rundschau* 55, p. 461 ff. Hessen, R.: *Preussische Jahrbücher* 61, p. 444 ff. Malkowsky, G.: *Gegenwart* 33, p. 158 ff. Klein, U.: *Kunstwart* 1, p. 242 ff.	Brausewetter, E.: *Henrik Ibsen, 1828–1888; Gesellschaft*, 4, 1888, 2; p. 238 ff. Eschweg, F.: *An Henrik Ibsen; Gesellschaft*, 4, 1888, 4; p. 794 (Verse). Hammer, F.: *Mein Verkehr mit Henrik Ibsen; Gesellschaft*, 4, 1888, 2; p. 741 ff. Kühnemann, E.: *Henrik Ibsens Geistesentwicklung und Kunst; Gesellschaft*, 4, 1888, 2; pp. 725 ff., 881 ff.

Year	Translations	Plays Presented
1888, con.	*Emperor and Galilean*	
		Lady Inger
		A Doll's House
1889		*The Lady from the Sea*

Where Presented	Critical Comment	Books, Essays
Berlin	Brahm, O.: *Kritische Schriften,* p. 224 ff.	
Berlin, Lessingtheater, Nov.	Brahm, O.: *Kritische Schriften,* p. 226 ff.	
	Hansen, I.: 1888, 1; p. 488 ff. *Eine deutsche Nora-Aufführung; Gesellschaft,* 4,	
Weimar, Feb. 12.		Jaeger, H.: *Ibsens Kindheit; Übertragen von E. Brausewetter aus Jaegers Henrik Ibsen,* 1828–1888; *Mag. f. Lit. d. Auslandes,* 1889; p. 289 ff.
Berlin, Schauspielhaus,[6] March 5.	Brahm, O.: *Kritische Schriften,* p. 232 ff. Fontane, T.: *Causerien,* p. 192 ff. Frenzel, K.: *Deut. Rundschau* 59, p. 299 ff. Zolling, T.: *Gegenwart* 35, p. 173 ff.	Schmidt, E. H.: *Henrik Ibsen als psychologischer Sophist,* Berlin. Steiger, E.: *Der Kampf um die neue Dichtung,* Leipsic.
	Kirchbach, W.: *Mag. f. Lit.,* 1889; p. 8 ff. Schollwöck, G.: *Grenzboten* 49, 2; 1890; p. 127 ff. Tovote, H.: *Gesellschaft,* 5, 1889, 2; p. 767 ff.	Parodies: Gumppenberg, H. v.: *Die Frau von der Isar, oder: Die verrenkte und wieder eingerenkte Ehe (Drama in einem Aufzug. Frei nach Ibsen),* Munich.

[6] The royal theater, Hofbühne, Hoftheater, at Berlin.

Year	Translations	Plays Presented
1889, con.		Ghosts
		The Pillars of Society
	Love's Comedy	
	Complete Works, edited by Hoffory (1889–1904); Reclam (1889–1903).	
1890		The Vikings at Helgeland

Where Presented	Critical Comment	Books, Essays
Berlin, Freie Bühne, Sept. 29.	Fontane, T.: *Causerien,* p. 185 ff. Medikus: *Ibsen und die Medizin; Gegenwart* 35; p. 200 ff.	Hartleben, O. E.: *Der Frosch von Henrik Ipse.* Zabel, E.: *Die Mitternachtssonne.*
Berlin, Deutsches Theater,[7] April.	Brahm, O.: *Kritische Schriften,* p. 239 ff. Harden, M.: *Gegenwart* 35, p. 270 ff. Brausewetter, E.: *Gegenwart* 36, pp. 170 ff., 185 ff.	
Berlin, Deutsches Theater, Feb. 12.	Frenzel, K.: *Deut. Rundschau* 63, p. 456 ff. Fulda, L.: *Freie Bühne* 1, p. 72 ff. Harden, M.: *Gegenwart* 37, p. 126 ff.	Andreas-Salomé, L.: *Die Wildente, Ein Märchen; Freie Bühne* 1, pp. 849 ff., 873 ff. Bahr, H.: *Henrik Ibsen, Zur Kritik der Moderne,* Zürich.

[7] The *Pillars of Society* enjoyed an incomparable popularity after its revival:

1890, Vienna, Deutsches Volkstheater; Budapest, Nationaltheater
1891, Berlin, Deutsches Theater
1894, Berlin, Berliner Theater
1895, Vienna, Burgtheater
1896, Berlin, Deutsches Theater, Lessingtheater
1896, Berlin, Schillertheater
Dresden, Hoftheater
Vienna, Deutsches Volkstheater
1897, Vienna, Burgtheater
Stuttgart, Hofth.
Hamburg, Pollinis Th.
1898, Berlin, Schauspielhaus

Year	Translations	Plays Presented
1890, con.		An Enemy of the People
		Ghosts
1891	*Hedda Gabler*	*Hedda Gabler*

Where Presented	Critical Comment	Books, Essays
Vienna, Hoftheater, Oct. 23.	Windholz, J.: *Gesellschaft,* 6, 1890, 4; p. 1855 ff. Brahm, O.: *Kritische Schriften,* p. 315 ff. Harden, M.: *Gegenwart* 38, p. 126 ff. Sch., L.: *Freie Bühne* 1, p. 783 ff.	Berg, L.: *Hebbel und Ibsen; Gegenwart* 37, p. 212 ff. Hansson, O.: *Ibsen und Strindberg in Deutschland; Mag. f. Lit.* 1890; p. 628. Hansson, O.: *Die Gespenster in Paris; Freie Bühne* 1, p. 499 ff. Harnack, O.: *Ibsens neue Dramen; Preuss. Jahrb.* 65, p. 55 ff.
Vienna, Volkstheater, Nov. 21.	Müller-Guttenbrunn, A.: *Dramaturgische Gänge,* p. 165 ff. Windholz, J.: *Gesellschaft,* 7, 1891, 1; p. 115 ff.	Marholm, L.: *Die Frauen der skand. Dichtung; Bühne* 1, pp. 168 ff., 261 ff., 365 ff.
Munich, Residenztheater, Jan. 31.	Bormann, W.: *Unsere Zeit,* 1891, 1; p. 278 ff. Brachvogel, W.: *Freie Bühne* 2, p. 117 ff.	Pawlowsky, M.: *Zwei Selbstgerichte; Gegenwart* 38, p. 181 ff. Oswald, E.: *Nora und was aus dem Puppenheim ward. Nach dem Englischen des Walter Besant,* Hamburg
Berlin, Lessingtheater, Feb. 10.	Anon.: *Grenzboten* 50, 1; p. 464 ff. Brahm, O.: *Freie Bühne* 2, p. 170 ff. Frenzel, K.: *Deut. Rundschau* 67, p. 455 ff. Harden, M.: *Gegenwart* 39, p. 14 ff.	Schellhas, F.: *Ibsen und der norwegische Volkscharakter; Gegenwart* 39, p. 390 ff. Stefánsson, J.: *Henrik Ibsen in England; Freie Bühne* 2, p. 809 ff.

Year	Translations	Plays Presented
1891, con.		
		The Pretenders
		An Enemy of the People
		The Wild Duck

Where Presented	Critical Comment	Books, Essays
	Harden, M.: *Gegenwart* 39, p. 124 ff. Kana, H.: *Sie ist Hedda Gabler; Freie Bühne,* 2, p. 91 ff. L., E. and Mauthner, F.: *Hedda Gabler* (Zwei Briefe); *Mag. f. Lit.,* 1891, p. 111 ff. H., O.: *Preuss. Jahrb.* 67, p. 310 ff.	Wilckens-Wien, M.: *Die Vererbungsfrage und Ibsen; Gegenwart* 39, p. 115 ff.
Vienna, Burgtheater, April 11, 14, 17.	Raaben, E.: *Freie Bühne* 2, p. 448 ff.	
Berlin, Hofbühne, May 31.	Harden, M.: *Gegenwart* 39, p. 365 ff. Mauthner, F.: *Mag. f. Lit.,* 1891, p. 363 ff. Schlenther, P.: *Freie Bühne* 2, p. 546 ff.	
Vienna, Burgtheater, April 16.	Raaben, E.: *Freie Bühne* 2, p. 448 ff.	
Vienna, Burgtheater, April 17; Volkstheater, April 16 (Ibsen Woche).	Müller-Guttenbrunn, A.: *Dramaturgische Gänge,*[8] p. 173 ff.	

[8] Reprints.

Year	Translations	Plays Presented
1891, con.		*The League of Youth*
		The Feast at Solhaug
1892		

Where Presented	Critical Comment	Books, Essays
Berlin, Freie Volksbühne, Oct.	Harden, M.: *Gegenwart* 40, pp. 254 ff., 270 ff. Mauthner, F.: *Mag. f. Lit.*, 1891, p. 670.	
Vienna, Burgtheater, Nov. 22.	Anon.: *Kunstwart* 4, p. p. 325 ff. Bierbaum, O.: *Ibsen auf der Flucht; Gesellschaft*, 7, 1891, 4; p. 1320 ff. Feldmann, S.: *Pariser Freie Bühne; Freie Bühne*, 2, p. 476 ff. Reyher, A.: *Ibsens Gespenster in Paris; Mag. f. Lit.*, 1891; p. 664 ff.	
	Anon.: *Kunstwart* 5, p. 258. Harnack, O.: *Ibsen in Rom; Mag. f. Lit.* 1892; p. 143 ff. M., E. de.: *Ibsens Nora (in Paris): Mag. f. Lit.*, 1892; p. 322.	Andreas-Salomé, L.: *Henrik Ibsen's Frauengestalten nach seinen sechs Familiendramen*, Berlin. Flaischlen, C.: *Jenseits von Ibsen; Freie Bühne* 3, p. 643 ff.

Year	Translations	Plays Presented
1893	*The Masterbuilder*	
		The Masterbuilder

Where Presented	Critical Comment	Books, Essays
		Marholm, Laura: *Ibsen als Frauenschilderer; Nord und Süd* 61, p. 101 ff. Nordau, Max: *Entartung,* Berlin Odinga, Thdr.: *Henrik Ibsen,* Erfurt
	Holm, E.: *Gegenwart* 44, p. 51 ff. Lachmann, H.: *Gesellschaft* 9, 1893, 1; p. 348 ff. Mauthner, F.: *Mag. f. Lit.,* 1892; p. 821 ff. Riess, M.: *Gegenwart* 43, p. 39 ff. Schuler, A.: *Gesellschaft* 9, 1893, 1; p. 352 ff.	Herzberg, N.: *Sind Ibsens Motive und Personen norwegisch; Mag. f. Lit.,* 1893; p. 609 ff.
Berlin, Lessingtheater, Jan. 19.	Anon.: *Gegenwart* 43, p. 63. Schlenther, P.: *Mag. f. Lit.,* 1893; p. 64.	
	Hansen, H.: Ibsens *Komödie der Liebe; Mag. f. Lit.,* 1893; p. 261 ff. Schlenther, P.: *Bermerkungen zu Ibsens Kaiser und Galiläer; Freie Bühne* 4, p. 1096 ff.	

Year	Translations	Plays Presented
1894		Ghosts
1895	*Little Eyolf*	

Where Presented	Critical Comment	Books, Essays
Berlin, Antoine's "Théâtre libre."	Anon.: *Für und wider Ibsen; Grenzboten* 53, 2; p. 614 ff. Albert, H.: *Pariser Brief, Der Kampf um Ibsen; Freie Bühne,* 5, 1894; p. 517 ff. Steinmayer, J.: *Krafft-Ebing gegen Ibsen; Gesellschaft,* 10, 1894, 2; p. 546 ff.	Brennert, H.: *Ibsen als Lyriker; Gegenwart* 45, p. 182 ff. Dresdner, A.: *Vom norwegischen Theater; Neue deut. Rundschau* 5, p. 1144 ff. K., J.: *Henrik Ibsen; Grenzboten* 53, 2; pp. 254 ff., 314 ff. Litzmann, B.: *Das deutsche Drama,* Hamburg, Leipsic. Mähly, J.: *Ibsen in Frankreich; Gegenwart* 46, p. 38 ff. Reich, E.: *Ibsens Dramen,* Dresden, Leipsic. Schönbach, A. E.: *Über Lesen und Bildung, Umschau und Ratschläge,* (4 Auflage), Graz. Stára, A.: *Dramaturgie nach katholischen Grundsätzen,* Vienna.
	Berg, L.: *Zwischen zwei Jahrhunderten,* p. 420 ff. Kerr, A.: *Mag. f. Lit.,* 1894; col. 1639 ff.	Stern, A.: *Studien zur Literatur der Gegenwart,* Dresden. Wicksteed, P. H.:

Year	Translations	Plays Presented
1895, con.		
		Little Eyolf
1896	*Catilina*	*Emperor and Galilean*
		Love's Comedy

Where Presented	Critical Comment	Books, Essays
	Richter, K.: *Gesellschaft* 11, 1895, 1; p. 241 ff. Schlenther, P.: *Neue deut. Rundschau,* 6, 1895, 1; p. 75 ff.	*Henrik Ibsen. Aus dem Englischen von E. B.; Preuss. Jahrb.* 82, pp. 98 ff., 218 ff., 470 ff. Woerner, R.: *Ibsens Jugenddramen,* Munich.
Berlin, Deutsches Theater, Jan. 12.	Anon.: *Gegenwart* 47, p. 45 ff. Schlenther, P.: *Preuss. Jahrb.* 81, p. 562 ff. Bahr, H.: *Wiener Theater,* p. 36 ff. R., W.: *Klein Eyolf in Paris; Mag. f. Lit.,* 1895, col. 764 ff. Anon.: (Brief comment on Ibsen in France) *Mag. f. Lit.,* 1895; col. 1435.	
Leipsic, Stadttheater, Dec. 5.	Harlan: *Mag. f. Lit.,* 1896; col. 1576 ff.	Berger, A. Freiherr v.: *Studien und Kritiken,* Vienna.
Berlin, Belle-Alliance Theater, Dec.	Anon.: (Brief comment on Ibsen in France) *Mag. f. Lit.,* 1896; col. 1485.	Harden, M.: *Literatur und Theater,* Berlin. Kerr, A.: *Der Ahnherr; Neue deut. Rundschau* 7, 1896, 2; p. 697 ff.

Year	Translations	Plays Presented
1897	*John Gabriel Borkmann*	
		John Gabriel Borkmann

Where Presented	Critical Comment	Books, Essays
	Lier, L.: *Zu modernen Dramatik; Kunstwart* 10, p. 17 ff. Schuré, E.: *Vortrag über Ibsen und d. Drama d. Innenlebens* (Brief review of); *Freie Bühne,* 1896; p. 609 ff.	Kerr, A.: *Ein Dramenjahr; Neue deut. Rundschau* 7, 1896, 1; p. 85 ff. Neumann-Hofer, O.: *Das Theater in Berlin; Cosmopolis* 1, p. 286 ff. Schweitzer, Ph.: *Geschichte der skandinavischen Literatur im 19.* Jahrhundert, Gera.
	Anon.: *Grenzboten* 56, 1; p. 347 ff. Avenarius: *Kunstwart* 10, 1896–7; p. 136 ff. Berger, A. Freiherr v.: *Cosmopolis* 5, p. 893 ff. Broicher, C.: *Preuss. Jahrb.* 87, p. 567 ff. Sadger, J.: *Gesellschaft* 13, 1897, 2; p. 105 ff. Sperans: *Sozialistische Monatshefte,* 1897, 2; p. 67 ff.	Jaeger, H.: *Henrik Ibsen,* 1828–1888. *Übersetzt von H. Zschalig* (2. Ausgabe), Dresden. Hanstein, A. v.: *Ibsen als Idealist,* Leipsic.
Frankfurt a. M.		
Berlin, Deutsches Theater, Jan. 29.	Anon.: *Gegenwart* 51, p. 93 ff.	

Year	Translations	Plays Presented
1898		
	The Warrior's Barrow *Olaf Liljekrans*[9] (Both in vol. II, Ibsen's Complete Works in the German Lang., ed. by Brandes, Elias, and Schlenther.)	
		Brand
		Emperor and Galilean

[9] The first appearance of the play in print; the Norse original was not published until 1902.

Where Presented	Critical Comment	Books, Essays
	Frenzel, K.: *Deut. Rundschau* 91, p. 147 ff. ? — 138 Poppenberg, F.: *Mag. f. Lit.*, 1897; p. 132 ff.	
	Pastor, W.: *Deut. Rundschau* 95, 1, 395 ff.	Bartels, A.: *Zu Henrik Ibsens siebzigstem Geburtstag; Kunstwart* 11, 1; p. 372 ff. Bleibtreu, K.: *Zu Ibsens 70. Geburtstag; Gesellschaft* 14, 1898, 2; p. 588 ff.
Berlin, Schiller Theater, March 17.	Anon.: *Gegenwart* 53 p. 222 ff.	Brausewetter, E.: *Ibsen zu Hause; Neue deut. Rundschau* 9, p. 532 ff.
Berlin, Belle-Alliance Theater, March 16.	Anon.: *Gegenwart* 53, p. 205 ff. Frenzel, K.: *Deut. Rundschau* 95, p. 312. Hart, J.: *Kunstwart* 11, 2; p. 9. Anon.: *Kunstwart* 11, 2; p. 188 ff. Cassel, P.: *Literarische Sendschreiben,* III, Berlin, 1900.	Busse, C.: *Der junge Ibsen; Gegenwart* 54, p. 229 ff. Falke: *Ibsen und das Burgtheater; Gesellschaft* 14, 1898, 3; p. 271 ff. Garde, A.: *Der Grundgedanke in Ibsens Dichtung, Übersetzt von C. Küchler,* Leipsic. Heimann, M.: *Henrik Ibsen; Neue deut. Rundschau* 9, p. 250 ff. Jerusalem, W.: *Wahrheit und Lüge; Deutsche Rundschau* 97, p. 224 ff.

Year	Translations	Plays Presented
1899		
1900	*When We Dead Awaken*	

Where Presented	Critical Comment	Books, Essays
		Polonsky, G.: *Gewissen, Ehe und Verantwortung,* Munich.
		Steiger, E.: *Die Bühne als Tribunal; Gesellschaft* 14, 1898, 1; p. 380 ff.
		Steiger, E.: *Henrik Ibsen und die dramatische Gesellschaftskritik,* Berlin.
	Lorenz, M.: *Baumeister Solnes; Preuss. Jahrb.* 98, p. 356 ff.	Brons, B.: *Ueber Peer Gynt von Henrik Ibsen mit Uebertrag. ins Plattdsch., Aurich.*
		Harnack, O.: *Essais und Studien (Über Ibsens sociale Dramen),* Braunschweig.
		Stümcke, H.: *Essays (Der Zauberer von Skien),* Leipsic
	Dressler, M.: *Preuss. Jahrb.* 102, p. 231 ff.	Anon.: *Ibsens romantische Stücke; Grenzboten* 59, 2; pp. 333 ff., 429 ff., 524 ff.
	Goldschmidt, A.: *Gegenwart* 57, p. 23 ff.	Bistram. Ottilie V.: *Ibsen's Nora und die wahre Emanzipation der Frau,* Wiesbaden
	Kerr, A.: *Neue deut. Rundschau* 11, 1900, 1; p. 213 ff.	J., C.: *Bücher über Ibsen; Grenzboten* 59, 1900, 4; p. 217 ff.
	Lier, L.: *Kunstwart* 13, p. 354 ff.	

Year	Translations	Plays Presented
1900, con.		
		When We Dead Awaken
		The Warrior's Barrow
		Brand
		Love's Comedy
1901		

Where Presented	Critical Comment	Books, Essays
	Lorenz, M.: *Preuss. Jahrb.* 99, p. 300 ff.	J., C.: *Weiteres über Ibsen; Grenzboten* 59, 1900, 3; pp. 360 ff., 492 ff., 591 ff.
Stuttgart		Jaeger, H.: *Ibsen und seine norwegischen Vorläufer; Gegenwart* 58, p. 229 ff.
Berlin, Deutsches Theater, March 17.	Anon.: *Gegenwart* 57, p. 190 ff. Frenzel, K.: *Deut. Rundschau* 103, p. 298 ff. Lorenz, M.: *Preuss. Jahrb.* 100, p. 369. Schikowski, J.: *Gesellschaft,* 1900, 3; p. 309 ff.	Specht, R.: *Kritisches Skizzenbuch, Wien.* Woerner, R.: *Henrik Ibsen I,* Munich. Ziegler, G.: *Ibsens Jugendwerke; Gesellschaft* 16, 1900, 1; p. 150 ff.
Vienna		
Vienna		
Berlin, Secessionsbühne, Sept. 15.	Anon.: *Gegenwart* 58, p. 206 ff. Lorenz, M.: *Preuss. Jahrb.* 102, p. 179 ff.	Berg, L.: *Henrik Ibsen, Studien,* Berlin, Leipsic, Cologne. Goldschmidt, K. W.: *Henrik Ibsen,* Berlin. Litzmann, B.: *Ibsens Dramen, 1877–1900,* Hamburg, Leipsic. Stein, P.: *Henrik Ibsen, Zur Bühnengeschichte seiner Dichtungen,* Berlin.

CITATIONS

Thatsächlich war durch diese beiden Stücke "Der Redakteur" und "Ein Fallissement" das Drama der Neuzeit in Skandinavien eingeführt und mit einer Stärke über die Bühne gegangen, welche alle "Schöngeister" vernichten musste. Es waren Signalraketen, die zum klaren Himmel emporstiegen und Salven hervorriefen, deren Echo wir noch nicht vergessen haben.

Björnson hatte seine Rolle ernst aufgefasst; ernstlich hatte er kämpfen wollen. Aber das Publikum hatte sich daran gewöhnt, durch seine Dichter Vergnügen zu geniessen und wollte sie nicht predigen hören. Man liebte es zu damaliger Zeit, schöne Verse zu machen über Freiheit oder die Rechte der Menschen, aber es waren die schönen Verse, nicht die Sache selbst, an denen man Gefallen fand!

(August Strindberg: Björnstjerne Björnson; *Freie Bühne*, 1891, S. 215.)

Paul Lindau hat die Empfindung des modernen Lebens, er steht inmitten unserer Bewegungen und Kämpfe, und fehlt ihm der Tiefblick auf den Grund dieser Strömungen, in ihre Ursachen und ihr Wesen, so hat er dafür die Gabe schnellen und leichten Erfassens der hervorspringendsten Erscheinungen, Schwächen und Irrungen des gesellschaftlichen Verkehrs . . .

(Frenzel: Berliner Dramaturgie, I. S. 317.)

HENRIK IBSEN

Von Otto Brahm

Als ich letztes Frühjahr nach Rom kam, sollte ich Henrik Ibsen Grüsse überbringen. Das Unternehmen stiess auf die unerwartete Schwierigkeit, dass die Wohnung des Dichters nicht festzustellen

war: denn weder das römische Adressbuch, das wenig weiss, noch die römische Fremdencolonie, die Alles weiss, konnten Auskunft geben. Man hatte wohl gehört, dass Ibsen seit Jahren in Rom wohnt, man sah ihn dann und wann, einsam im Menschengewühl, den Corso entlang schreiten; aber Niemand verkehrte mit ihm in täglichem Umgange, Niemand hatte seine Behausung erblickt. Endlich sagte man mir, dass der Dichter um die siebente Abendstunde, mit unerbittlicher Regelmässigkeit, einen Gang ins Café Aranjo thue; ich trat dort ein, und auf eine ungefähre Beschreibung erhielt ich die Bestätigung, dass der Gesuchte an dieser Stelle täglicher Gast sei. Es muss wohl ein Deutscher sein, lautete die Auskunft; viele Deutsche grüssen ihn, aber Keiner spricht mit ihm. Er sitzt immer ganz allein an seinem Tische.

Indem kam Ibsen herangeschritten: eine mittelgrosse Gestalt von kräftigem Bau der Glieder, mit einem energisch ausgeprägten strengen Kopfe, dessen mächtiger Typus Michelangelo's Phantasie hatte anreizen können. Grauweisses starres Haar steigt voll und hoch empor über einer breiten, von Gedankenarbeit ausgewölbten Stirn; eine Brille verdeckt blaugraue kleine Augen nicht, die mit scharfer Aufmerksamkeit umherblicken und durch Form und Hülle auf den Kern der Dinge zu dringen scheinen. Um den feinen Mund, dessen schmale Lippen sich vorsichtig nach innen zurückziehen, spielt ein leises Lächeln; der Bart, der nach unten zu sich verbreitert, ist nach englischer Art gehalten und gibt diesem entschlossenen Kopfe den charakteristischen Abschluss.

Die Bekanntschaft ward schnell gemacht; und schnell erfuhr ich aus des Dichters Munde, wie tief in seiner Anschauung die Einsamkeit dieses Lebenswandels begründet ist. Mit seinem "Volksfeind" spricht Ibsen: "Der stärkste Mann der Welt ist derjenige, welcher allein steht."

(*Deutsche Rundschau* 49, 1886; S. 193.)

In dieser Stimmung hat er in einer Umgebung, die Goethen die Iphigenie und den Tasso diktirten, den "Brand" vollendet, ein

Werk rauhester Art, von durch und durch protestantischer Färbung, voll des kategorischen Imperativs. Aber inmitten eiserner Willenskräfte hat der Dichter sein Agnes gestellt, ein Weib und Mutter, ebenso hilflos und dem Untergange geweiht wie ein verirrter Schmetterling in der ungeheuern Gebirgswüste des norwegischen Fjeldes, eine dichterische Gestalt ersten Ranges, ebenbürtig einer Imogen oder einem Gretchen.

(Emanuel Brunn: "Peer Gynt" von Henrik Ibsen; *Magazin f. d. Lit. d. Auslandes* 99, 1881, 1; S. 73–74.)

Det gamle illusoriske Frankrig er slået istykker; når nu også det nye faktiske Preussen er slået istykker, så er vi med et spring inde i en vordende tidsalder. Hej, hvor ideerne da vil ramle rundt omkring os! Og det kan sandelig også være pa tiden. Alt det vi til dato lever på, er jo dog kun smulerne fra revolutionsbordet i forrige århundrede, og den kost er jo dog nu længe nok tygget og tygget om igen. Begreberne trænger til et nyt indhold og en ny forklaring. Frihed, lighed, og broderskab er ikke længer de samme ting, som de var i salig guillotinens dage. Dette er det, som politikerne ikke vil forstå, og derfor jeg hader dem. De mennesker vil kun specialrevolutioner, revolutioner i det ydre, i det politiske o. s. v. Men alt sligt er pilleri. Hvad det gælder er menneskeåndens revoltering. . . .

(Til Georg Brandes, Dresden, den 20 December, 1870. Breve fra Henrik Ibsen I, S. 220 ff.)

Wir haben es hier (*Kronprätendenten*) mit einem Stücke von markiger Kraft, von Kühnheit und Gedankenreichthum und von einer schönen Sprache zu thun . . . und wir könnten uns wohl vorstellen, dass dasselbe, mit Geschick für unsere Bühne eingerichtet, einen guten Erfolg zu gewärtigen hätte. Ein gleich günstiges Prognostikon wagen wir dem zweiten Stücke "der Bund der Jugend" jedoch nicht zu stellen. Dasselbe behandelt das Parteigetriebe der Neuzeit, und vielen der gezeichneten Charaktere begegnen wir auch bei uns; dennoch liegen uns die geschilderten Verhältnisse zu fern, als dass wir, bei aller Anner-

kennung, die wir dem Bau und der Sprache zollen, ein lebhafteres Interesse dafür fassen könnten.

(J. H.: Henrik Ibsen, ein norweigischer Dramatiker; *Mag. f. d. Lit. d. Auslandes* 82, 1872, 2; p. 367 fg.)

Es ist eine Vergeudung von Zeit, Arbeit und Geld, sich mit Schauspielen abzuquälen, die trotz ihres poetischen Werthes sich niemals auf einem deutschen Theater einbürgern werden, weil sie uns in ihrem Kern ewig fremd sind und sein werden.

(Frenzel, *Deutsche Rundschau* 8, 1876; S. 154.)

Überall die Löwenklaue des Dichters, nirgends der geborene Dramatiker. Das lyrische und das epische Element überwuchern so sehr den dramatischen Bau, dass ohne die rücksichtsloseste Anwendung des Rothstiftes gar nicht an die Vorführung dieser Dichtungen als Theaterstück zu denken ist.

(Frenzel, *Deutsche Rundschau* 14, 1878; S. 485.)

In Vienna, Berlin, and Hamburg, the following conclusion was substituted for the original of *A Doll's House:*

NORA: — Dass unser Zusammenleben eine Ehe werden könnte. Leb' wohl! (*Will gehen.*)

HELMER: — Nun dann gehe! (*Fasst sie am Arm.*) Aber erst sollst du deine Kinder zum letzten Male sehen!

NORA: — Lass mich los! Ich will sie nicht sehen. Ich kann nicht.

HELMER (*zieht sie gegen die Thür links*): Du sollst sie sehen. (*Öffnet die Thür und sagt leise:*) Siehst du, dort schlafen sie sorglos und ruhig; morgen, wenn sie erwachen und rufen nach ihrer Mutter, dann sind sie — mutterlos.

NORA (*Bebend*): — Mutterlos —!

HELMER: — Wie du es gewesen bist.

NORA: — Mutterlos! (*Kämpft innerlich, lässt die Reisetasche fallen und sagt:*) Oh, ich versündige mich gegen mich

selbst, aber ich kann sie nicht verlassen. (*Sinkt halb nieder vor der Thür.*)

HELMER (*freudig, aber leise*): — Nora!

(*Der Vorhang fällt.*)

Auch der wärmste Verehrer des Dichters . . . wird zugeben müssen: das Werk ist vieldeutig. Es fehlt die sichere Führung von Stufe zu Stufe bis zur Höhe hinauf, die eine freie Ausschau über das Ganze gewährt. Man fühlt sich wie in einem Hause mit einer grossen Zahl von Zimmern, deren jedes drei und mehr Thüren hat, unter denen die Wahl frei steht; man ist nie sicher, durch die richtige gegangen zu sein, und im nächsten Raume hebt der Zweifel von Neuem an. Das reizt freilich, über den verwickelten Plan zur Klarheit zu gelangen, oder mit überzeugung sagen zu können: Unsinn. Wer aber den Versuch machen wollte, einen einheitlichen Gedanken bis ins Einzelne nachzuweisen, oder umgekehrt zu zeigen, dass ein einheitlicher Gedanke nicht aufzufinden ist, müsste sich entschliessen, einen Commentar zu schreiben, der leicht ein Buch werden könnte.

. . . . . .

Auch wer das Ganze für ein Buch mit sieben Siegeln hält, wird in Einzelnen Scenen von grosser dramatischer Kraft, Stellen von poetischer Schönheit, geistvolle Ausprüche in Fülle finden.

(Ernst Wichert: Henrik Ibsen; *Im neuen Reich,* 1880, 2; S. 901.)

Schliesslich erinnert sich jeder Leser, dass Peer Gynt der Sohn eines Säufers und einer Tollhäuslerin war, und fängt an, das Thema nicht mehr der Poesie, sondern der Krankheitsgeschichte des menschlichen Geistes zu überweisen, wohin es nach unserer Meinung auch hingehört.

(Eugen Zabel: Henrik Ibsen; *Unsere Zeit,* 1881, 1; S. 527.)

Der Peer Gynt gleicht in der Beziehung manchen Musikstücken, die erst nach wiederholtem Hören sich uns gleichsam entschleiern; einer Bach'schen Fuge oder einer der letzten gros-

sen Kompositionen Beethovens. Wie vieler Jahrzehnte hat es nicht bedurft, bis man die "Neunte Symphonie" zu schätzen vermocht hat! Man wolle nicht übersehen, dass der Fidelio bei seiner ersten Aufführung auf den grössten Widerspruch stiess; dass ein Dichter wie Heinrich von Kleist mehrere Jahrzehnte bedurfte, um auch nur genannt zu werden.

(Emanuel Brunn, *Mag. f. d. Lit. d. Auslandes* 99, 1881; S. 77.)

Kein grösserer Schmerz für einen Dichter, als die Lüge, welche die Welt beherrscht; nicht jene naive Lüge des phantasievollen Menschen oder des Kindes und des Uebertreters, die nach einer Ausrede suchen; sondern die allgemeine, konventionelle, hochgeachtete Lüge, welche sich in Gesellschaft, Politik, Staat und Kirche breit macht, mit der Anmassung der Alleinberechtigung auftritt und die Wahrheit verfolgt. Diese Lüge in jeder Form aufzudecken und an den Pranger zu stellen, ist seit Menander und Aristophanes die Aufgabe jedes Dichters gewesen, der sich nicht in eine ideale Welt flüchtet, sondern seinen Blick auf die Gegenwart richtet.

. . . . . .

Dieses neueste Drama Ibsens hat die Bedeutung eines die Luft reinigenden Gewitters. Es handelt nicht mehr von Hecuba, nicht von den Freuden und Leiden einer einsamen Menschenseele, es führt uns zu den höchsten Höhen der Menschheit wie auf einen der grossen schneeigen Bergkolosse Norwegens und zeigt uns über dem Qualm der niedern Tallandschaft die silberfunkelnde Bergreihe einer fernen aber erreichbaren Gebirgsweite. Mit sicherm Schritt, wie ein Alpenführer, leitet er uns hinauf; denn hier schweigt jedes Bedenken, jeder kleinliche Zweifel.

(L. Passarge: Ein neues Drama von Ibsen; *Mag. f. d. Lit. d. Auslandes* 103, S. 98, 101.)

Da geschah es eines Tages, dass wir in das winzige "Stadttheater" in der Lindenstrasse gerieten, zu den "Stützen der Gesellschaft"; und sogleich empfingen wir die erste Ahnung

einer neuen poetischen Welt, wir fühlten uns, ein erstesmal, vor Menschen unserer Tage gestellt, an die wir glauben konnten, und aus einer allumfassenden sozialen Kritik der Gegenwart sahen wir die Ideale der Freiheit und der Wahrheit als die Stützen der Gesellschaft, siegreich emporsteigen. Von Stund an gehörten wir dieser neuen Wirklichkeitskunst, und unser ästhetisches Leben hatte seinen Inhalt empfangen.

(Brahm: Kritische Schriften, S. 447 fg.)

Ueber all dem blinkenden und schillernden Theaterplunder ringsum gingen uns damals die jungen Augen auf. Wir bebten und jauchzten. . . . Wir gingen immer wieder ins Theater; tagüber lasen wir in Wilhelm Langes scheusslichem Deutsch das Stück. Weder die poesielose, papierne Uebersetzung, noch die bretternen Seelen der Vorstadtschauspieler konnten gegen die Gewalten dieser Dichtung an. So muss neunzig Jahre früher Schillers Kabale und Liebe auf die nicht mehr ganz unreife Jugend gewirkt haben. . . . Durch dieses Stück erst lernten wir Ibsen lieben, fürs Leben lieben. Ich darf für viele meiner Altersgenossen das Bekenntniss ablegen, dass unter dem Einfluss dieser modernen Wirklichkeitsdichtung zur entscheidenden Lebenszeit in uns diejenige Geschmackslinie entstand, die fürs Leben entschieden hat. Im Zeitalter der genialsten Realpolitik herangebildet, trat uns hier die kräftigste Realpoesie entgegen. Aus Handel und Wandel des alltäglichen Lebens, aus Geschäft und Arbeit sahen wir eine Dichtung aufsteigen, die uns um so tiefer ergriff, je weniger uns die Epigonen Schillers oder die vertrocknete Nachromantik genügten. Es war eine Lust zu leben, solange Schiller und Goethe schufen, es war eine Lust zu leben, solange die Romantik blühte — nun war es wieder eine Lust zu leben, denn mit uns lebte ein Dichter, der den Inhalt unserer Zeit in eigene Hände nahm.

(Paul Schlenther: Ibsens sämmtliche Werke in deutscher Sprache, VI, S. XVII, XVIII.)

Mit nye skuespil er nu udkommet og har vakt en voldsom allarm i den skandinaviske presse. Daglig modtager jeg breve og avisartikler for og imod . . . jeg anser det for en fuldstændig umulighed for tiden at få dette stykke opfört på noget tysk teater; jeg tror neppe at man i de nordiske lande tör spille det in den nærmeste fremtid.

(To Ludwig Passarge, Rome, Dec. 22, 1881. *Breve, II,* p. 97.)

Die schöne Pflicht, ein ganzes Publikum in planmässigen Zusammenhang in den Gedankengang des Dichters einzuführen, und durch eine Darstellung seiner modernen Schauspiele, vom " Bund der Jugend " an gerechnet, die deutschen Theaterbesucher Ibsen-reif zu machen, hat bisher Niemand eingelöst. Aber näher oder ferner, die Zeit muss kommen, in der die Erkenntniss solcher Pflicht unter uns aufsteht. Denn hier ist ein Dichter erwachsen, der, allem Epigonenthum entsagend, zum unbekannten Strande den Mast richtet: den es mit wehenden Wimpeln einer im Werden begriffenen Kunst entgegen zieht.

(Otto Brahm: Henrik Ibsen; *Deutsche Rundschau* 49, S. 219, 220.)

Ich habe etwas Ähnliches nie wieder erlebt. Nachdem der Vorhang zum erstenmal gefallen war, herrschte einige Secunden lang tieffste Ruhe, alles stand unter dem Banne der mächtigen Dichtung. Dann aber brach ein Sturm, ein Orkan, los, wie ich ihn im Theater noch nicht gehört hatte. Widerspruchlos, einstimmig wurde der Dichter hervorgejubelt, und willig, siegestrunken liess er sich oftmals an die Rampen ziehen, wärend ihm die hellen Freudenthränen über die Wangen liefen.

(Lothar: Henrik Ibsen, S. 112.)

. . . Wenn die Entwicklung in aller Dichtung hierauf ziehlt, poetisches neues Land dem Leben abzugewinnen, gleich wie Faust Land abzwang dem Meere — so ist kein neuerer Dramatiker kühner und grossartiger nach vorwärts geschritten als der Verfasser der " Gespenster." . . .

Aber was ist denn das Neue, Entscheidende in dem Werke? Es ist die unbedingte Wahreit, die unbarmherzige, grelle Wahrheit, wenn man will, in der Schilderung menschlicher Charaktere. Menschen stellt der Dichter vor uns hin, wirkliche und leibhaftige Menschen, in voller Figur gesehen, rundum und ganz; und gerade weil er est wagt, hinter diese Gestalten so unbedingt zurückzutreten, so neigen diejenigen, die nicht wissen, was das heisst: künstlerische Objectivität, stets von neuem dazu, dem Dichter und seine Menschen zu identifizieren.

(Brahm: Kritische Schriften über Drama und Theater, S. 107 fg.)

"Rosmersholm." Ibsens Dramen sind ein fortgesetzter Kampf gegen die Lüge und ein Sieg des Geistes und der Wahrheit. Worin liegt ihre dramatische Stärke? In der Handlung? Es gibt hundert Stücke mit mehr und äusserlich beteudenderer Handlung. Im Dialog? Es gibt eleganteren, flüssigeren, leichter fasslichen Dialog. Im Effekt? Die gemeinen Effekte sind fast puritanisch vermieden.— Ihre sieghafte Stärke liegt einzig in der Idee, in der strikten Ausführung dieser Idee, die nichts vom ihrem Ziel ablenkt — kein falscher Effektzierrat, kein Phrasengeschnörkel, keine überflüssigen Romankapitel. Der eine Gedanke, der das Stück aufbaut, ist so gross, so wahr und erschütternd, dass er uns fortreisst, erdrückt — und frei macht! Ibsen kennt wie kein anderer moderner Dichter das Geheimnis der dramatischen Wucht. . . .

Es mutet uns ja manches fremdartig an in den Charakteren, den Sitten, der Redeweise. Es ist ein anderer, reckenhafter, rauherer und zugleich träumerischerer Menschenschlag, der da spricht und handelt — aber wir fühlen doch, so und so müssen diese urgermanischen Hünennaturen sprechen und handeln. . . .

Ich glaube, wir Deutsche von heute vermögen's nicht ganz und voll (Ibsen aufzuführen)— und das ist sehr schade. Eine bessere Zukunft muss bei uns für Ibsen nicht nur das rechte Publikum, sondern auch die rechten Darsteller erziehen. Die ewige Französelei hat beide unfähig gemacht, die wahrhaftige deutsche

Kunst aus reiner Quelle zu schöpfen — und zu ertragen. Darum ist Ibsen so vielen ein Ärgernis.

(L. Willfried: Dramatische Litteratur; *Gesellschaft,* 1887, 2; S. 748 fg.)

Zwar ist es richtig, dass der Realismus heutzutage sehr eingerissen ist, das ist aber eine Krankheit der Zeit ebenso wie die sentimentale Richtung, die den Werther im vorigen Jahrhundert hervorrief. Für diese Krankheit fehlt vorläufig der Arzt, aber ich zweifele keinen Augenblick daran, dass er kommen werde. Freilich hinterlässt fast jede Krankheit ihre Spuren, wirkt aber häufig läuternd und wohltuend auf den ganzen Organismus; wir wollen hoffen, dass auch jetzt diese Wirkung nicht ausbleiben wird. So sind der Pessimismus, Realismus, Naturalismus, etc. nur Geschwüre, Auswüchse, die vielleicht eine nahende Revolution ankündigen, und deren schlechte Säfte aus dem Ganzen, so lange es noch gesund und lebensfähig ist, ebenso mit der Zeit ausgestossen werden müssen, wie das früher mit solchen Dingen der Fall gewesen ist. Zudem ist unter den Realisten eine solche Verschiedenheit, dass man manchmal kaum weiss, woran man ist, ich möchte fast sagen, es giebt auch idealistische Realisten.

(H. von Pilgrim: Die Bühne und ihre Zukunft; *Magazin f. d. Lit. d. Auslandes* 111, 1887; S. 329.)

Solche Dramen, wie z. B. die von Henrik Ibsen, beweisen dadurch, dass sie jetzt gerade Mode sind, wie wenig Lebenskraft in ihnen steckt. Es ist niemals Sache der Kunst gewesen uns das Widerwärtige vorzuführen, das Ebenmass und die ruhige, erhabene Schönheit sind ihre Kennzeichen; es ist Zeit, dass wir uns wieder die Worte unseres unsterblichen Dichters ins Gedächtnis zurückrufen:

Ernst ist das Leben, heiter ist die Kunst.

(H. von Pilgrim: Die Bühne und ihre Zukunft; *Magazin f. d. Lit. d. Auslandes* 111, 1887; S. 330.)

Es war im Café Maximilian. Seit Ibsen In München wohnt, ist er dort täglich zu sehen, bei jedem Wetter, abends zwischen ½7 und ½8, zu keiner andern Stunde, immer am zweiten oder dritten Tischchen rechts vom Eingang, gewöhnlich ganz allein, ein Seidel Bier oder ein Gläschen Cognac mit einer Wasserflasche vor sich, in der Hand ein Zeitungsblatt, über welches er meistens hinausliest mit seinem grossen ruhigen Blick, denn die Menschen, die hier ein- und ausgehen, sind selbst eine Chronika, eine lebendige Zeitungssammlung, mindestens ebenso wichtig und interessant, wie das bedruckte Papier der Tagesblätter. Sehr oft sitzt Ibsen auch da wie ein steinerner Gast, unbeweglich, den Blick nach innen gekehrt, die Lippen eingekniffen, die linke Hand auf dem Schenkel, die rechte leicht auf dem Marmortischchen ruhend, die Finger als hielten sie die Feder — wie in Gedanken am Werktisch, in absorbierender Denkarbeit. Dann steht er ruhig auf, nimmt Stock, Cylinderhut, Handschuhe, die immer nebenan auf dem Stuhle liegen, und geht still zur Thür hinaus mit kurzen, leisen Schritten.

Also es war in Café Maximilian. Als ich daselbst Henrik Ibsen zum dritten Male gesehen hatte, fasste ich mir ein Herz, seine Einsamkeit zu stören; ich ging hin und stellte mich vor. Er gab mir die Hand und blieb stehen; als das Formelle weggeredet war, lud er mich ein, mich zu ihm zu setzen. Er sprach in einem leisen, milden Ton, wobei sein sonst unbewegliches Gesicht einen ungemein gewinnenden, warmen Ausdruck bekam. Ich habe ihn seitdem nie anders sprechen hören.

(Fritz Hammer: Mein Verkehr mit Henrik Ibsen; *Gesellschaft*, 1888, 2; S. 741, 742.)

In Dänemark und Norwegen ist die Bühne zum Katheder geworden, auf dem die Frauenemancipation, das sociele Wesen der Ehe, die Kindererziehung, die Unsittlichkeit der oberen Stände, das traurige Loos der Mädchen aus dem Volke, der Kampf gegen Branntwein erörtert werden; die dramatische Form wird nicht der Kunst, sondern ihrer stärkeren Wirkung auf grosse Massen wegen gewählt. Absichtlich stellt sich das

dichterische Talent in den Dienst der Volkswohlfahrt; für den Realismus, der nach Wahrheit und nicht nach Schönheit verlangt, müssen schliesslich die Zwecke und Mächte, die mit der Kunst an sich nichts zu thun haben, die Hauptsache werden. In diesen Gleisen wandelt Ibsen, seit er das Stück "Stützen der Gesellschaft" schrieb, nur dass seine Tendenzen bei dem Schleier, der auf seinen letzten Werken ruht, dem Zuhörer unklarer bleiben und der Rest von Idealismus, der in ihm steckt, immer in die realistiche Fabel und Charakteristik ein phantastiches Element hineinschmuggelt. So fühlt der Zuschauer wohl, dass die Absicht des Dichters in dem Schauspiel "Die Wildente" dahin geht, die Erbärmlichkeit und Nichtswürdigkeit des Lebens und der Durchschnittsmenschen gegenüber der "idealen Forderung" darzustellen und die völlige Trostlosigkeit seiner Weltanschauung zum ergreifenden Ausdruck zu bringen: aber diese Empfindung wird beständig durch die Betrachtung verwirrt, dass Gregers Werle, der die "ideale Forderung" stellt, ein Narr ist, dessen täppisches hereinfahren den Tod eines liebenswürdigen Kindes verschuldet, während er einen moralisch gesunkenen Freund zu einem neuen Leben erheben will. Wie Johannes Rosmer ist auch Gregers Werle von der fixen Idee besessen, aus Alltagsmenschen "Adelsmenschen" machen zu wollen, um nach dem Scheitern seines Versuches zu erkennen, dass er keine andere Bestimmung hat als der Dreizehnte bei Tisch zu sein.

. . . . . .

Diese Unklarheiten, dieser Mangel an Freimuth, die Dinge bei ihren wahren Namen zu nennen, sind charakteristisch für Ibsen's Darstellungsweise; wir, die Zuschauer, sollen erraten, was er, der Dichter, nicht klipp und klar zu sagen wagt.

. . . . . .

Die Schilderung der vier Personen, ihrer Umgebung in der Mischung von Dürftigkeit und Phantastik, die Trottelhaftigkeit des Alten, Gina's Resolutheit, das verschwommene, verlogene, schauspielerische Wesen Hjalmar's, der poetische Duft, der Hewig umschwebt, ist in ihrer Wahrheit und ihrer eigenthümlichen Localfarbe bewunderungswürdig und von ergreifender

Wirkung. Selbst die Symbolik mit der Wildente stört nicht allzusehr; man gewöhnt sich an das abenteuerliche Geschöpf des Dichters, so gleichgültig es auch für die Handlung ist.

(Karl Frenzel; *Deutsche Rundschau* 55, S. 461, 462, 463.)

Darum berührt uns jedes neue Werk Ibsens wie eine Entdeckung auf dem Gebiete der dramatischen Kunst, eine Erweiterung ihrer Grenzen. Das Studium dieses Dichters aber sei allen empfohlen, die das Schlagwort der Unfähigkeit unserer Zeit zum Drama nachbeten, vor allem aber sei es empfohlen dem jungen Deutschland.

Ibsens Dramen sind die beste Poetik für angehende Dramatiker (womit natürlich noch lange nicht die Nachahmung empfohlen sein soll), sie sind auch die beste Ethik für werdende Männer.

(Julius Brand; *Gesellschaft,* 1888, 2; S. 1137–38.)

Fast könnte man sagen: Ibsen ist Hebbel redivivus in vollkommenerer Gestalt. Er ist gleichsam seine Erfüllung. Beinahe Alles, was Hebbel versucht, hat Ibsen erreicht; was jener gewollt, hat dieser durchgesetzt. Wo bei jenem nur noch ein dunkeles Ressentiment bestand, heerscht bei Ibsen helles Bewusstsein und volle Klarheit. Es gibt vielleicht nicht bald ein zweites Beispiel in der Litteraturgeschichte, wie das an dem einen Ort unterbrochene Schaffen fast unmittelbar an einem anderen aufgenommen wird: der Eine ist die Voraussetzung des Anderen, wie dieser die Rechtfertigung des Ersten.

(Leo Berg: Zwischen zwei Jahrhunderten; Hebbel und Ibsen, S. 260.)

Der ganze Ibsen ist also eine alte deutsche Melodie, über deren Sinn sich unsere Väter bereits den Kopf zerbrochen hatten, z. B. der alte Vischer, der den Hebbel sein Lebtag bewundert und geliebt, aber nie begriffen hat.)

(Berg: Hebbel und Ibsen, S. 272.)

Ibsen ist ein grosses dichterisches Genie und er hat eine ganze Reihe von Stücken geschrieben, die unsere Bewunderung ver-

dienen. Die "Gespenster" aber können wir nicht dazu zählen. Die kühne, vielvermögende dramatische Gestaltungskraft des Dichters, imponirt uns auch in dem technischen und psychologischen Aufbau dieses Dramas, und Ibsen's Kunst der Charakteristik ist in den "Gespenstern" so gross wie in seinen reifsten Schöpfungen; aber das Widerwärtige zu adeln, das Willkürliche der Erfindung zu mildern, das hat seine Kunst nicht vermocht. Schiller betrachtete die Schaubühne als moralische Anstalt, Ibsen betrachtet sie in den "Gespenstern" als Strafanstalt für die Gesellschaft, als einen Sezirsaal. Er will uns nicht mit Worten, nicht mit schönen Sittensprüchen bessern, er kommt mit dem Messer des Anotomen und beweist uns als Vivisektor an den lebendigen Menschen seiner Dichtung, was aus unseren Nachkommen wird, wenn wir lasterhaft sind. . . . Und er verstrickt sich schliesslich in all' jene Irrthümer und Willkürlichkeiten, in welche unsere philosophierenden Naturwissenschaftler so häufig verfallen.

(Adam Müller-Guttenbrunn: Dramaturgische Gänge, S. 166.)

Man muss diesem Abschluss des peinlichen Stückes eine gewaltige poetische Kraft zuerkennen. Aber zu spät hat Ibsen sich daran erinnert, dass er Dichter ist; der Leser kann sich dem Eindruck dieser Poesie vielleicht hingeben, der Zuschauer im Theater hat schon die Flucht ergriffen, wenn die Sonne über den Sumpf emporsteigt.

(Müller-Guttenbrunn: Dramaturgische Gänge, S. 170.)

. . . Denn dies zuerst und zuletzt treibt sie in ihr pathologisches Thun, treibt sie in den Tod: Dass sie dem ungeliebten drolligen Manne ein Kind gebähren soll, einen leibhaftigen kleinen Jörgen, während Lövborg's und Thea's geistiges Kind, das grosse Zukunftswerk, den Namen des glücklicheren Paares zu den Sternen trägt. Und dann all dies Hässliche, dies unfreiwillig Drollige, was sich für ihren egotistischen Schönheitssinn an das Mutterwerden knüpft, die lächelnden Bemerkungen

der Intimen, das Krankenbett vielleicht und der Verlust ihrer reifen Reize—"still davon!" ruft zornig sie dem Rathe zu, "nie sollen sie etwas derart erleben." . . . Eine Versorgungs-Ehe hat sie, unfähig ihr eigenes Leben zu gestalten, eingehen müssen, und an dem Widerspruch zwischen den verbildeten sozialen Zuständen, die sie so weit getrieben, und dem freien Willen einer stärkeren Natur, die die Hörigkeit nicht dulden kann, zerschellt sie: gerade hier erweitert sich, was ein eng psychologischer Vorgang schien, zum modernen Weltbilde. Ein sozialer Typus wird deutlich, wie Nora, wie Ellida; und was der Meister, in die Zukunft hellen Sinnes blickend, so geschaffen, kann weder durch törichtes Einreden noch durch seelenloses Darstellen dauernd verdunkelt werden. Auch wenn "Hedda Gabler" jetzt von der Bühne verschwindet, sie wird wiederkehren . . . und was sie dramatisch gilt, werden wir durch die Kontrolle der Bühne dann erst erfahren. . . .

(Otto Brahm; *Freie Bühne* II, S. 171.)

(Brahm: Kritische Schriften, S. 324, 325.)

Was wollte denn eigentlich dieser Martin Greif? Ich verstehe nicht. Was schreibt er denn für Dramen? Die Dramen von Leuten, die längst todt sind, die er niemals gekannt. Kann man über Unbekannte Dramen schreiben? Was gehen dem Martin Greif die Todten an? Er soll sie doch in Ruhe lassen und die Lebendigen dramatisieren soviel er will. Jetzt stört er die todten bayerischen Fürsten in ihrer Grabesruhe. Wenn er mit diesen fertig ist, kommen wohl die hohenzollerischen dran. Es ist wahr, es gibt genug todte Fürsten. Die Geschichte ist gross. Aber das ist heute doch nicht die Aufgabe der Dramatik.

(Lothar: Henrik Ibsen, S. 127.)

. . . Es schwirrt und rauscht hier durcheinander wie in einer grossen Symphonie, und diese Symphonie ist nichts anders als die Ouvertüre zu Henrik Ibsens moderner Produktion. Schon hier klingen alle Leitmotive vor. Als Bischof Nicolas den verhängnissvollen Brief des Pfarrers Trond in Händen hält,

sagt er: "Hier hinter diesem dünnen Siegel liegt Norweg's Geschichte für hundert Jahre. Sie liegt und träumt, wie der junge Vogel im Ei!" So liegt und träumt in den Kronprätendenten Ibsens moderne Dichterseele. . . .

Wenn wir uns dem historischen Stoffgebiet so sehr entfremdet haben, dass trotz ihren rein menschlichen Consequenzen auch die Kronprätendenten etwas erkaltend Haupt- und Staatsactionmässiges haben, so sind Hauptursache daran Ibsen's "Wildente," Ibsen's "Gespenster," Ibsen's "Nora." . . . Es gibt auch in der Kunst eine Art Stoffwechsel, und wie Formen veralten und entstehen, so entstehen und veralten auch Stoffe. Das historische Drama entspricht nicht dem Geiste unserer Zeit. . . . Das spürt man auch am Eindruck der Kronprätendenten. . . . Es kommen nun neue Wege, und erst eine feinere, wiederum veränderte Zeit wird zurückkehren zu echt dichterischer Anschauung historischer Vergangenheiten. Trotzdem sollten unsere Theaterdirektoren und Dramatiker sich durch solche Erwägungen nicht von dem Gedanken abbringen lassen, auch Ibsen's grösstes Werk, sein Weltdrama "Kaiser und Galiläer" auf Bühnenfähigkeit hin zu prüfen. Denn dieses Werk umfasst keine in sich abgeschlossene Zeit, es umfasst, wie Goethe's Faust, die Welt.

(Paul Schlenther; *Freie Bühne* II, S. 548, 549.)

Geschichtlich betrachtet war es doch eine unabweisliche Notwendigkeit, dass Ibsen, als er mit seinen modernen Stücken zu uns kam, Vorbild des deutschen Dramas werden musste. Denn was man als Aufgabe ahnte, fand man bei ihm zuerst klar erkannt, bestimmt ausgedrückt künstlerisch verarbeitet; und ich wüsste nicht, bei wem man sonst hätte diese Vorzüge finden können.

(Albert Dresdner: Das Dritte Drama; *Der Kunstwart* IV, S. 290.)

Der Kunstwart, V (1891–92), p. 258

Anonymous review of an article in the *Allg. Zeitg.* by Ernst Gnad. Quoted from Gnad:

"Aus Ibsens Werken weht uns der Lufthauch eines kommenden Jahrhunderts entgegen, worin vieles fallen soll, was wir bisher als sichere Grundpfeiler unseres Daseins betrachtet haben. Der voellige Bruch mit allem wirklich oder scheinbar Ueberlebten giebt ihnen ein ganz modernes Gepraege in einer Zeit, die, wie die unsrige, von dem dunkeln Vorgefuehl grosser Umwaelzungen auf allen Gebieten des Lebens erregt und beunruhigt wird."

Fast mit jedem Ibsen'schen Drama hebt sich aus einem verborgenen Reich eine mystiche Kraft in unsere Welt, die Leben gewinnt, indem sie beim Namen genannt wird, zu der wir selbst längst in unbewusster Beziehung gestanden. Im Baumeister Solness ist es das *Unmögliche.* Er hat einmal das Unmögliche getan. Über die Grenzen seines Vermögens hinaus eine That, die ihm in der Erinnerung als etwas Furchtbares und Übermenschliches und zugleich als die flüchtige Erfüllung seiner höchsten Sehnsucht erscheint.

(Hedwig Lachmann; *Gesellschaft* IX, 1893, 1; S. 348–349.)

Gott ist tod; nicht nur für den einsamen Grübler ist er tod; sie haben längst auch den frohen Kindern des bunten Lebens den Glauben an ihn genommen. Und dieser Wahn war eben nur einer von vielen. Die anderen Wahnbegriffe — oder: Ideale — versinken wie er. Nichts Edles bleibt, keine sogenannte Liebe, nichts Feststehendes, kein Streben, das des Strebens wert ist, keine Glücksmöglichkeit. Das Gesetz der Umwandlung herrscht; die Hüllen sinken und was hold und leuchtend erschien, ist kalte graue Selbstsucht; der Mensch hat nichts so eigen, wie sich selbst; nicht zwei Seelen in der weiten Welt gehören zu einander. S. 1640.

Was ich an Klein Eyolf innig bewundere und verehre, und worauf es ankommt, ist: dass dieses Werk gewisse Empfindungen

wachruft, die eine schlechtweg religiöse Gewalt haben, und das es etwas bietet, was nur die grossen Schöpfungen grosser Menschen bieten: Ewigkeitsperspektiven. S. 1643.

(Alfred Kerr; *Mag. f. Lit.*, 1894.)

Der von der Tageskritik vergeblich angefochtene Ibsenglaube triumphirt: Die Thoren, dass sie wähnen, dieser Mann werde jemals Sieches und Schwächliches in die Welt schicken! Erlahmt seine Kunst, so werden sich die auf einander gepressten Lippen eben noch fester schliessen, und er wird verstummen. Auch seine Künstlerschaft wird in Schönheit und Kraft sterben.

. . . . . .

Nicht minder unwahr ist die sich wiederholende Versicherung, die Alterswerke entbehrten der Bühnenwirkung. Gewiss, bei einem eiligen, stumpfen Publikum, das zwischen Geschäft und Souper schnell ein paar Erregungen erhascht! Einer hingebungsvollen Kunstgemeinde sind gerade die letzten Schöpfungen Ibsens Offenbarungen des höchsten Genius, deren erschütternde Wirkung nicht ihresgleichen hat. Ich habe Klein Eyolf in mässiger Darstellung auf der Bühne gesehen, vor einem Publikum, das keinen weiteren Vorzug hatte, als dass es nicht blasirt war und den naiv-heiligen Glauben an die Kunst besass. Ich habe nie ein Publikum in einer ähnlichen Ergriffenheit gesehen. Freilich strömen diese Werke Wirkungen aus, die nicht in der Garderobe bereits erlöschen. Sie begleiten uns auf die Strasse, in's Haus, in den Traum und erwachen mit uns wieder. Ich hörte damals die Antwort einer Frau auf die Frage, wie ihr Klein Eyolf gefallen: Ich weiss *noch* nicht. Das naive Geständniss zeigt die einzige Möglichkeit eines Verhältnisses zu Ibsen.

. . . . . .

Ibsen lässt sich nicht auf platte Formeln ziehen. Das Unendliche ist in ihm. Wie in Natur und Leben bleibt in seinen Dichtungen ein Rest des Unergründlichen. Die Vieldeutigkeit ist die dichterische Lebenskraft seiner Werke. Ein simpler

Vorgang, in sauberster Arbeit lückenlos gefügt . . . steigt zur feierlichen Transzendenz empor. Es sind Märchendramen in Geist, Wirklichkeiten in Stoff. Musikalische Stimmungen liegen über diesen Dichtungen gebreitet, fest begrenzt in der Gefühlsfärbung, zerflatternd im begrifflichen Ausdruck.

(Sperans: Banquier-Symbolismus; *Sozialistische Monats-Hefte,* Heft II, 1897; S. 87, 88.)

En spillemand har ikke hjem eller bo,
hans hu stævner vidt, han aldrig finder ro!
Hver den, som ejer en sangbund i sit bryst,
han er hjemløs i dale, han er hjemløs ved kyst;
i liens løvsal, på den grønnende eng
må han synge og røre den dirrende streng,
han må lure på det liv, som lønligt bor
under fossens væld, ved den vilde fjord,
må lure på det liv, som i brystet banker,
klæde folkets drømme i toner og ord;
og klare dets gærende tanker!
(*Olaf Liljekrans,* Tredje Akt, tiende Scene.)

München, den 13. Februar, 1887.

Herr stud. art. Bjørn Kristensen.

. . . . . .

Kravet på arbejde gar ganske visst igennem " Rosmersholm."

Men foruden dette handler stykket om den kamp, som ethvert alvorligt menneske har at bestå med sig selv for at bringe sin livsførelse i samklang med sin erkendelse. . . .

Men først og fremst er stykket naturligvis en digtning om mennesker og menneskeskæbner. . . .

(Breve fra Henrik Ibsen, 2; S. 168.)

München, den 4. December, 1890.

Herr greve!

. . . . . .

Det er i dette stykke ikke egentlig såkaldte problemer, jeg har villet behandle. Hovedsagen har for mig været at skildre mennesker, menneskestemninger og menneskeskæbner på grundlag af visse gældende samfundsforhold og anskuelser. . . .

(Breve fra Henrik Ibsen, 2; S. 193, 194.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

MAGAZINES:

Bibliog. der deutschen Zeitschriften-Litteratur, Leipsic, 1897–1901.

Cosmopolis, Paris, 1896–98.

Deutsche Rundschau, Berlin, 1874–1900.

Freie Bühne für modernes Leben, Berlin, 1890–1893.

Gegenwart, Berlin, 1872–1900.

Gesellschaft, Munich, 1885–86; Leipsic, 1887–1900.

Grenzboten, Leipsic, 1870–1900.

Im neuen Reich, Leipsic, 1871–1881.

Jahresberichte für neuere deutsche Litteraturgeschichte, 1892–1900.

Kunstwart, Dresden, 1887–1900.

Magazin für die Literatur des Auslandes (Later, *Mag. f. d. Lit. d. In- und Auslandes; Mag. f. Literatur*), Berlin, 1870–78; Leipsic, 1879–87; Dresden, 1888–90; Berlin, 1891–96; Berlin and Weimar, 1897.

Neue deutsche Rundschau (*Freie Bühne*), Berlin, 1894–1900.

Nord und Süd, Berlin, 1877–78; Breslau, 1879–90, 1895–96.

Preussische Jahrbücher, Berlin, 1870–1900.

Sozialistische Monatshefte, Berlin, 1897–1900 (Incomplete).

Unsere Zeit, Leipsic, 1870–1891.

Anzengruber, Ludwig: *Gesammelte Werke,* 10 vol., Cotta, Stuttgart, 1897–98.

Bjørnson, Bjørnstjerne: *Samlede Værker,* 11 vol., Gyldendal, København, 1900–02.

Hebbel, C. Friedrich: *Werke;* R. M. Werner, ed.; 26 vol., B. Behr, Berlin, 1901–13.

Ibsen, Henrik: *Samlede Værker,* 10 vol., Gyldendal, Kjøbenhavn, 1898–1902.

Ibsen, Henrik: *Sämtliche Werke in deutscher Sprache;* Brandes, Elias, and Schlenther, ed.; 10 vol., S. Fischer, Berlin, 1898–1903.

Ibsen, Henrik: *The Collected Works of;* William Archer, ed.; Chas. Scribner's Sons, New York, 1906.

Ibsen, Henrik: *Breve fra;* Halvdan Koht and Julius Elias, ed.; 2 vol., København, Kristiania, 1904.

. . . . . .

Aall, A.: *Henrik Ibsen als Dichter und Denker,* Max Niemeyer, Halle a. S., 1906.

Acher, M.: *Ibsens drittes Reich,* Kosmos, Wien, 1900.

Alberti, Conrad (Sittenfeld, K.): *Der moderne Realismus in der deutschen Litteratur,* Druckerei A. G., Hamburg, 1889.

Andreas-Salomé, Lou: *Henrik Ibsen's Frauengestalten nach seinen sechs Familiendramen,* H. Lazarus, Berlin, 1892.

Arnold, R. F.: *Das moderne Drama,* Trübner, Strassburg, 1908.

Bahr, Hermann: *Wiener Theater,* 1892–1898, S. Fischer, Berlin, 1899.

Bahr, H.: *Zur Kritik der Moderne,* Verlags-Magazin, Zürich, 1890.

Bartels, A.: *Die deutsche Dichtung der Gegenwart,* Eduard Avenarius, Leipzig, 7 ed., 1907.

Berg, Leo: *Zwischen zwei Jahrhunderten,* Rütten & Loening, Frankfurt a. M., 1896.

Berg, L.: *Henrik Ibsen und das Germanenthum in der modernen Literatur,* Richard Eckstein Nachfolger, Berlin.

Berg, L.: *Henrik Ibsen,* Albert Ahn, Köln, 1901.

Berger, Alfred v.: *Studien und Kritiken,* Literaturgesellschaft, Wien, 1896.

Berger, A. v.: *Über Drama und Theater,* Eduard Avenarius, Leipzig, 2 ed., 1900.

Bleibtreu, C.: *Revolution der Litteratur,* Wilhelm Friedrich, Leipzig, 3 ed., 1887.

Bölsche, W.: *Die naturwissenschaftlichen Grundlagen der Poesie,* Carl Reissner, Leipzig, 1887.

Brahm, Otto: *Henrik Ibsen,* Freund & Jeckel, Berlin, 1887.

Brahm, Otto: *Kritische Schriften über Drama und Theater; Hrsg. von Paul Schlenther,* S. Fisher, Berlin, 1913.

Brandes, Georg: *Moderne Geister,* Rütten & Löning, Krankfurt, 1897.

Bulthaupt, H.: *Dramaturgie des Schauspiels,* IV, Schulz'sche Hofbuchhandlung, Oldenburg, 1901.

Collin, J.: *Henrik Ibsen,* Carl Winter, Heidelberg, 1910.

Conradi, Hermann: *Gesammelte Werke,* 3 vol., Georg Müller, München, Leipzig, 1911.

Ernst, Paul: *Henrik Ibsen* (Die Dichtung I), Schuster & Loeffler, Berlin, Leipzig.

Fontane, Th.: *Causerien über Theater; Hrsg. von P. Schlenther;* F. Fontane & Co., Berlin, 1905.

Frenzel, Karl: *Berliner Dramaturgie,* 2 vol., Friedrich Bartholomäus, Erfurt.

Garde, Axel: *Der Grundgedanke in Henrik Ibsens Dichtung, Übertragen von Carl Küchler;* Walther Fiedler, Leipzig, 1898.

Gosse, Edmund: *Henrik Ibsen,* Chas. Scribner's Sons, New York, 1907.

Hanstein, A. v.: *Ibsen als Idealist,* Gg. Freund, Leipzig, 1897.

Hanstein, A. v.: *Das jüngste Deutschland,* R. Voigtländer, Leipzig, 1901.

Harden, Max.: *Litteratur und Theater,* Freund & Jeckel, Berlin, 1896.

Hart, Heinrich und Julius: *Kritische Waffengänge,* Otto Wiegand, Leipzig, 1882–84.

Holz, Arno: *Die Kunst, Ihr Wesen und Gesetze,* Wilhelm Issleib, Berlin, 1891.

Jaeger, H.: *Literaturhistorie,* Hjalmar Bigler, Kristiania, 1896.

Kerr, Alfred: *Das neue Drama,* S. Fischer, Berlin, 1905.

Kirchner, F.: *Gründeutschland,* Kirchner & Schmidt, Wien, Leipzig, 1893.

Litzmann, B.: *Das deutsche Drama in den litterarischen Bewegungen der Gegenwart,* Leopold Voss, Hamburg, Leipzig, 4 ed., 1897.

Litzmann, B.: *Ibsens Dramen,* 1877–1900, Leopold Voss, Hamburg, Leipzig, 1901.

Lothar, R.: *Henrik Ibsen,* E. A. Seemann, Leipzig, Berlin, Wien, 3 ed., 1902.

Lublinski, S.: *Die Bilanz der Moderne,* Siegfried Cronbach, Berlin, 1904.

Martersteig, M.: *Das deutsche Theater im 19. Jahrhundert,* Breitkopf und Härtel, Leipzig, 1904.

Meyer, R. M.: *Die deutsche Literatur des 19. Jahrhunderts,* Georg Bondi, Berlin, 3 ed., 1906.

Müller-Guttenbrunn, A.: *Dramaturgische Gänge,* E. Pierson's Verlag, Dresden, Leipzig, 1892.

Nordau, Max: *Degeneration,* Trans. from 2 ed., D. Appleton Co., New York, 1895.

Passarge, L.: *Henrik Ibsen,* Bernhard Schlicke, Leipzig, 1883.

Reich Emil: *Ibsens Dramen,* E. Pierson's Verlag, Dresden, 5 ed., 1906.

Schmitt, Eug. H.: *Ibsen als Prophet,* Fritz Eckhardt, Leipzig, 1908.

Soergel, A.: *Dichtung und Dichter der Zeit,* R. Voigtländer, Leipzig, 1911.

Steiger, Edgar: *Der Kampf um die neue Dichtung,* Wilhelm Friedrich, Leipzig, 1889.

Steiger, E.: *Das Werden des neuen Dramas,* 2 vol., Egon Fleischel & Co., Berlin, 1903.

Stein, Philipp: *Henrik Ibsen, Zur Bühnengeschichte seiner Dichtungen,* Otto Elsner, Berlin, 1901.

Stern, A.: *Studien zur Literatur des Gegenwart,* V. W. Esche, Dresden, 1895.

Witkowski, G.: *Das deutsche Drama des 19. Jahrhunderts*, Teubner, Leipzig, 1904.

Woerner, R.: *Henrik Ibsen*, I, E. H. Beck, München, 1900.

Woerner, R.: *Henrik Ibsen*, II, E. H. Beck, München, 1910.

INDEX

Numbers in italics refer to Appendix.

Adler, Leopold, 109
Ahnen, Die, see *Our Forefathers*
Alberti, Conrad (K. Sittenfeld), 92, 92 n.
Allzeit Voran, 53 n.
Arent, Wilhelm, 57
Anatol, 102 n.
Angèle, 102 n.
Angelo, Michael, 26
Antoine, André, 82
Anzengruber, Ludwig, 13 n., 15, 25 n., 87 ff., 87 n., 122
Aristophanes, 50
Arne, 20
Assumption of Hannele, The, 102 n., 120
Augier, Émile, 13, 61, 62

Bach, Johann Sebastian, 42
Bad Company, 57
Bahr, Hermann, 89 ff., 92, 108, 120
Balzac, de, Honoré, 15
Bankruptcy, A; 19 n., 21, 22, 22 n., 24, 25, 34, 34 n., *136*
Barker, Granville, 19 n.
Baudissin, Count Wolf, 27
Becque, Henri, 19 n.
Beethoven, van Ludwig, 42, 112
Before Dawn, 25 n., 82, 93, 102 n.
Beiden Genossen, Die, see *The Comrades*
Beyond Human Power, 25 n.
Berg, Leo, 55, 60 n., 61 ff., 83, 107
Berliner Dramaturgie, 23 ff.
Betrogenen, Die, see *The Deceived*
Between the Battles, 20, 22 n., 23, *136*
Biberpelz, Der, 102 n.
Birkeland, Michael, 29 n.
Björnson, Bjernstjerne, 15, 18, 19–25, 31, 31 n., 58, 86, 117, *136, 138*
Bleibtreu, Karl, 57, 92, 98 ff.
Blumenthal, Oscar, 66
Book of the Day, 57
Bölsche, Wilhelm, 93
Brahm, Otto, 26, 50 ff., 55, 59, 60, 65, 68, 73, 74, 80, 82, 93, 95, 100, 115, 116, 129
Brand, 27, 30, 30 n., 44, 85 n., 90, 115, 115 n., 117, 128 n., *133, 136, 166, 170*
Brandes, Georg, 28, 36, 40, 40 n., 48, 48 n., 58
Bread, 92, 92 n.
Brennert, H., 117
Brot, see *Bread*
Brunn, Emanuel, 27, 42
Buch der Zeit, see *Book of the Day*
Bulle, Oscar, 68 ff.
Burns, Robert, 117
Business is Business, 19 n.
By Grace of Heaven, 25 n.
Byron, George Gordon, 113

Carolingians, The, 53 n., 54
Catilina, 44, 117, *133, 162*
Christoph Marlowe, 53 n.
Comrades, The, 57
Conrad, M. G., 72 n.
Conrad-Ramlo, Frau, 82 n., 95

Dämmerung, 102 n.
Darwin, Charles Robert, 15, 21, 124
Deceived, The, 57

Degenerate, The, 57
Destiny, 92, 92 n.
Doll's House, A, 19 n., 34, 34 n., 36 ff., 36 n., 41, 43, 44, 45 ff., 58, 59, 77, 79, 94, 97, 114, 127, *134, 138, 140, 148*
Dorfgänge, 87 n.
Dostoevski, Feodor, 16, 17 ff., 29 n.
Dramatic Epilog, see *When We Dead Awaken*
Drei Reiherfedern, Die, 103 n.
Droescher, 115
Dumas, Alexander, *fils,* 13, 61, 62, 126
Dumont, Louise, 70
Durch, 55 n., 93
Duse, Eleonora, 80

Editor, The, 21, 22 n.
Ehre, Die, 82 n., 103 n.
Einsame Menschen, see *Lonely Lives*
Eliot, George, 40
Emilia Galotti, 84
Emperor and Galilean, 97, 98, 98 n., 109 ff., 115 ff., *134, 146, 162, 166*
Enemy of the People, An, 19 n., 27, 41, 41 n., 48 ff., 62, 63, 65, 65 n., 66, 89, 93, 94, *134, 140, 144, 150, 154*
Ephraims Breite, 102 n.
Erbförster, see *The Forester's Heir*
Erdgeist, Der, 103 n.

Fallissement, Ein, see *A Bankruptcy*
Familie Selicke, Die, see *The Selicke Family*
Father, The, 25 n.
Father and Sons, 53 n., 54
Faust, 41, 44, 61, 97, 128, 130
Feast at Solhaug, The, 97, 98, 98 n., 113, *133, 146, 156*
Fidelio, 43
Fifth Commandment, The, 25 n., 87
Fitger, Arthur, 25 n.
Flaubert, Gustave, 15
Florian Geyer, 102 n.
Forester's Heir, The, 66, 85
Free Theater, 25 n., 82 ff., 83 n., 92, 93
Freie Bühne, see Free Theater
Frenzel, Karl, 23 ff., 32 ff., 39 ff., 46, 62, 74, 79, 83, 114, 115, 119, 121, 122
Freytag, Gustav, 53
Friedensfest, Das, 102 n.
Frühlings Erwachen, 103 n.
Fuhrmann Henschel, 102 n.
Fulda, Ludwig, 102 n.

Garde, Axel, 118
Gauntlet, A, 25 n.
Ghosts, 25 n, 41, 41 n., 44, 50, 58 ff., 60 n., 63, 65, 66, 71, 78, 82, 87 n., 88, 91, 97, 114, 127, *134, 140, 142, 148, 152, 158*
Glück im Winkel, Das, 103 n.
Goethe, v., J. W., 12, 14, 27, 41, 44, 52, 57, 66, 97, 103, 122, 130
Goncourt, Edmond and Jules, 25 n.
Gossman, Frau Friederike, 82 n.
Götz von Berlichingen, 66
Greif, Martin, 97 n.
Grieg, John, 29, 29 n.
Gutzkow, K., 129 n.
Gyges und sein Ring, 85 n.

Halbe, Max, 102 n.
Hammer, Fritz, 72
Hanna Jagert, 102 n.
Hansen, M. C., 117
Hanstein, von, Adalbert, 118
Harold, 53 n., 54
Hart, Julius, 92
Hart, Julius and Heinrich, 53 n., 82
Hartleben, Otto Erich, 102 n.
Hauptmann, Carl, 102 n.
Hauptmann, Gerhart, 25 n., 82, 102 n., 104, 120, 125, 126
Hebbel, C. Friedrich, 48, 70, 83 ff., 85 n., 86 ff., 89 n., 122, 129 n., 130

Hedda Gabler, 89, 94 ff., 94 n., 98, 98 n., 103, 107, 110, 127, 129, *135, 152*
Hegel, Frederik, 30 n.
Heimat, see *Magda*
Heinrich und Heinrichs Geschlecht, 53 n.
Henriette Maréchal, 25 n.
Herodes und Mariamne, 85 n.
Hertz, Henrik, 19
Hertz, Wilhelm, 28
Hettner, Hermann, *27*
Heyse, Paul, 28
Hirschfeld, Georg, 102 n.
Hoffory, J., 98
Holz, Arno, *55, 57,* 82 n., 99, 102 n., 125
Huttens letzte Tage, see *The Last Days of Hutten*

Ibsen, Sigurd, 105
Iffland, A. W., 84
Iphigenie, 27
Irma, 92, 92 n.

John Gabriel Borkman, 19 n, 110 ff., *135, 164*
Josephson, Ludwig, 115, 115 n., 117
Judith, 129 n.
Jugend, 102 n.
Jugendfreunde, 102 n.
Julia, 87 n.
Julius Cæsar, 14

Kabale und Liebe, see *Love and Intrigue*
Kainz, Joseph, 82
Kameraden, Die, 102 n.
Karolinger, Die, see *The Carolingians*
Keller, Gottfried, 53 n.
Kerr, Alfred, 108 ff.
Kierkegaard, Sören, 21
Kingsley, Charles, 123
Klein, Ulrich, 76
Kleist, von, Heinrich, 43, 66, 83, 130
Kollege Crampton, 102 n.
Königskinder, 102 n.
Körner, Theodor, 110
Kotzebue, von, August, 84
Kretzer, Max, 57
Kühnemann, Eugen, 78
Küster, Konrad, *55*

La Dame aux Camélias, 13, 70
Lady from the Sea, The, 78 ff., 80 ff., 98, 98 n., 110, *134, 146, 148*
Lady Inger of Östråt, 34, 34 n., 77, 113, *133, 138, 146*
Lange, Wilhelm, 35, 51
Last Days of Hutten, The, 53
Laube, H., 38 n.
League of Youth, The, 22, 22 n., 30, 49, 59, 85 n., 97, *134, 136, 154*
Lear, 62
Leopardi, Giacomo, 117
Lermontoff, M. Y., 117
Lessing, G. E., 83, 84
Liebelei, 102 n.
Lier, L., 116
Lindau, Paul, 13 ff., 24, 36 ff., 46, 48, *52*
Lindberg, August, 60 n.
Little Eyolf, 107 ff., 107 n., 109 n., 110 ff., 114, *135, 160, 162*
Litzmann, Berthold, 91 ff.
Lobedanz, Edmund, 29
Lombroso, Cæsar, 117
Lonely Lives, 102 n., 104
Lothar, R., 97 n., 126
Love and Intrigue, 51, 84
Love's Comedy, 98, 98 n., 116, *133, 150, 162, 170*
Ludwig, Otto, 66, 85, 86, 87, 122

Macbeth, 62
Mackay, John Henry, *55*
Magda, 14, 103 n.
Malkowsky, Georg, 64
Maria and Magdalene, 14, 24
Maria Magdalena, see *Mary Magdalene*
Marlowe, Christopher, 19
Mary Magdalene, 84, 85, 85 n., 129 n.

Masterbuilder Solness, 81, 105 ff., 107 n., 110, 114 n., 120, *135, 158*
Maurice, 39 n.
Mauthner, Fritz, 34 n., 82, 110
Meiningen, Duke of, 14, 23
Meininger Court Troupe, 14 ff., 23, 31, 53, 59, 122
Meister Ölze, 102 n.
Menander, 50
Menonite, The, 52 n., 54
Mee hainee, 15
Meyer, C. F., 53
Michael Kohlhaas, 66
Mill, John Stuart, 21
Mirbeau, Octave, 19 n.
Mise Sara Sampson, 84
Modern Poets, 57
Moderne Dichtercharaktere, see *Modern Poets*
Morituri, 103 n.
Mozart, W. A., 113
Müller, Max, 21
Müller-Guttenbrunn, A., 92
Musset, de, A., 117
Mütter, Die, 102 n.
Mutter Erde, 102 n.

Nana, 123
Napoleon (Bonaparte), 92 n.
Neue Gebot, Das, 53 n.
Neuen Menschen, Die, see *New men*
Neuvermählten, Die, see *The Newly-Married Couple*
Newly-Married Couple, The, 19 n, 20, 22, 24 ff., *138*
New Men, 92, 92 n.
Nibelungen, The, 89 n., 129 n.
Niemann-Raabe, Frau Hedwig, 38 n., 80, 82 n.
Nietzsche, Friedrich, 127
Nissen, Hermann, 70
Nora, see *A Doll's House*
Nordau, Max, 117 f.
Nygifte, De, see, *The Newly-Married Couple*

Oehlenschläger, A. G., 19
Olaf Liljekrane, 113 ff., 114 n., *133 n., 164*
Othello, 62
Our Forefathers, 53
Ovid, 61

Papa Hamlet, 99
Passarge, Ludwig, 41, 44 ff., 49, 58
Peer Gynt, 41 ff., 41 n., 44, 90, 116, *134, 140*
Petöfy, S., 117
Pillars of Society, The, 19 n., 22, 22 n., 28, 32 ff., 32 n., 33 n., 34 n., 35, 37, 49, 50 ff., 74, 81, 85 n., 93, 94, *134, 138, 150, 151*
Poems, 29, 41, *136, 140, 142*
Powers of Darkness, The, 25 n.
Pretenders, The, 29, 29 n., 30, 31 ff., 44, 96 ff., 98, 109, *133, 136, 138, 154*
Prozor, Count, 127

Quagmire, 92, 92 n.
Quitzowe, Die, 53 n.

Rabensteinerin, Die, 53 n.
Raphael, 113
Ravens, The, 19 n.
Reich, Emil, 104 ff.
Reicher, Emanuel, 70
Reinhardt, Max, 70
Réjane, Gabrielle, 80
Reuter, Fritz, 53 n.
Ring of the Nibelungen, The, 89 n.
Rosmer, Ernst, 102 n.
Rosmersholm, 19 n., 62, 63, 66 ff., 68 n., 75, 78, 98, 98 n., 99, 120, 127, *134, 144*
Rousseau, J. J., 17
Rückert, H., 31

Sardou, V., 13, 61, 62
Sauer, Oscar, 70, 77
Schicksal, see *Destiny*
Schiller, von, F., 14, 51 ff., 57, 66, 75, 78, 84, 88, 100, 122

Schlaf, Johannes, 55, 82 n., 99 n., 102 n., 125
Schlechte Gesellschaft, see *Bad Company*
Schlenther, Paul, 50 ff., 55, 82, 96, 109
Schmetterlingsschlacht, Die, 103 n.
Schmidt, R., 73
Schnitzler, Arthur, 102 n.
Schopenhauer, Arthur, 127
Scribe, A. E., 13
Selicke Family, The, 82 n., 99, 102 n., 119
Shakspere, W., 14, 68, 73, 78, 83, 91, 130
Siebold, P. F., 30, 30 n.
Sittliche Forderung, Die, 102 n.
Sklavin, Die, 102 n.
Sodoms Ende, 92 n., 103 n.
Sorma, Agnes, 80
Spencer, Herbert, 21
Sperans, 110 ff.
Spielhagen, Friedrich, 40, 53
Steiger, Edgar, 39 n.
Stein, Philipp, 66, 70, 81, 105, 114 n.
Stettenheim, Julius, 82
Strindberg, August, 21 n., 25 n.
Strodtmann, Adolf, 30 ff., 31 n.
Sturmflut, 53 n.
Sudermann, Hermann, 14, 82 n., 92 n, 103 n., 126
Sumpf, see *Quagmire*
Synnöve Solbakken, 20

Taine, Hippolyte, 21
Talisman, Der, 102 n.
Théâtre libre, 82
Thomas Münzer, 92 n.
Tasso, 27
Tochter des Erasmus, Die, 53 n.
Tolstoy, Leo, 15, 16 ff., 25 n., 29 n., 100, 120
Triesch, Irene, 80

Vater und Söhne, see *Father and Sons*
Verkommenen, Die, see *The Degenerate*
Verlorene Paradies, Das, 102 n.
Versunkene Glocke, Die, 102 n.
Vierte Gebot, Das, see *The Fifth Commandment*
Vikings at Helgeland, The, 22 n., 32, 34, 34 n., 89, 89 n., 94, *133, 138, 150*
Vinje, A. O., 117
Vor Sonnenaufgang, see *Before Dawn*
Voysey Inheritance, The, 19 n.

Wagner, Richard, 12, 89 n.
Waldleute, 102 n.
Wallner, Franz, 59 ff.
Warrior's Barrow, The, 113, *133 n., 164, 170*
Weavers, The, 102 n., 119, 119 n.
Weber, Die, see *The Weavers*
Wedekind, Frank, 103 n.
Welhaven, J. S., 31 n.
Wergeland, Henrik, 31 n., 117
Werther (Die Leiden des jungen Werthers), 71, 130
When We Dead Awaken, 116 ff., 116 n., 128, 128 n., *135, 168*
Wichert, Ernst, 41
Wild Duck, The, 67, 68, 72 ff., 73 n., 78, 79, 91, 97, 98, 98 n., 99, *134, 146, 154*
Wildenbruch, von, Ernst, 15, 53 ff.
Wille, Bruno, 93
Witkowski, G., 25 n.
Woerner, Roman, 118
Wolff, Eugen, 55 ff.

Zabel, Eugen, 42, 43
Zola, Émile, 15 ff., 29 n., 99, 100, 123, 125, 126, 130
Zolling, Theophil, 48
Zwischen den Schlachten, see *Between the Battles*